



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



3 3433 06913458 7

2XDP
CARPENTER

2

1000

1000

AN
EXAMINATION
OF
BISHOP MAGEE'S
CHARGES
AGAINST
Unitarians and Unitarianism.

AN
EXAMINATION

OF THE
CHARGES

MADE AGAINST

Unitarians and Unitarianism,

AND THE

IMPROVED VERSION,

BY THE

RIGHT REV. DR. MAGEE, BISHOP OF RAPHOE,

IN HIS

*“DISCOURSES AND DISSERTATIONS ON ATONEMENT
AND SACRIFICE :”*

WITH SOME

**STRICTURES ON THE STATEMENTS OF THE BISHOP OF
ST. DAVID'S, DR. HALES, DEAN GRAVES, DR. NARES,
DR. PYE SMITH, AND MR. RENNEL, &c.; AND
ON THE SYSTEM PURSUED BY SOME
RECENT EDITORS OF THE
GREEK TESTAMENT.**

BY

LANT CARPENTER, LL. D.

Bristol :

PRINTED AND SOLD BY T. J. MANCHEE.

**SOLD ALSO BY LONGMAN, HURST, REES, ORME, AND BROWN,
AND ROWLAND HUNTER, LONDON ;
AND BY PARSONS AND BROWNE, BRISTOL.**

1820.



437,

PREFACE,

INCLUDING SOME REMARKS ON DR. HALES'S

FAITH IN THE HOLY TRINITY, &c.

THE Author of this volume, after ascertaining that Mr. Belsham had no intention of answering Dr. Magee's *Discourses and Dissertations*, first formed the purpose of engaging in a Reply, so far back as the year 1814, in consequence of the representations of a highly valued Friend, who had peculiar means of knowing the sentiments of the Unitarian public. Thus far, and thus far alone, is any individual besides myself answerable for this work, or any part of it. For the course I have adopted, and my mode of following it, whatever censure may be deserved must rest on me alone.

To detail the causes which have operated to delay the execution of my design, would be useless. Those who know my manner of life are fully aware that the incessant engagements arising from the duties of a Minister of the Gospel, and those of a Preceptor of Youth, can allow me very little that can be called quiet leisure ; and various circumstances, connected with my public and private relations, have most commonly

prevented my ability to devote even that little to an occupation not well suited to the hours of fatigue, and (as far as respects the examination of Dr. Magee's work) seldom affording any relaxation by its interesting character. To pass by such circumstances as would be recollected only in the circle of intimate friendship, and some literary engagements which I could not satisfactorily avoid, the virulent controversy in Exeter (to which I shall again advert in this Preface), and the various interruptions connected with my removal to my present residence, have operated greatly in preventing the completion of my work.

I have found, indeed, that it required a devotement of time frequently beyond what I could command; and long intervals occurred, during which my attention was necessarily called away from it. Often, I must honestly say, I was disposed to relinquish, as a hopeless task, the engagement under which I had virtually laid myself. That the examination to which it led me was wearisome, and often, in its results, disgusting, must have had some influence; but the chief point was, that the end to be answered, should I ever reach the end, seemed scarcely deserving the great and certain loss of time, and the probable pecuniary injury to my family. And nothing but the apprehension that, by undertaking a Reply, I had prevented some other from doing so, and the reiterated representations of various public opponents of Unitarianism, implying that Dr. Magee's work was of standard authority and unassailable,—together with the mode in which its opprobrious invectives and disgraceful misrepresentations were detailed by others as *authority*,—would have roused again my

determination to proceed, by reviving the hope that I might thus serve a cause, which I feel it the great honour and happiness of my life to promote where Providence affords the opportunity.

For the last two years, however, the delays which I regret, but cannot much charge upon myself, have greatly originated in a gradual deviation from my first purpose; and I was led to this by the system adopted by Dr. Magee in his *Postscript*, and by the high commendations passed upon this additional volume, in a Review which is understood to represent the sentiments of the still most extensive and powerful party in the Church of England.* My original intention was, to leave the Bishop's charges against Unitarians and Unitarian Writers to their fate; and to confine my reply, almost wholly,

* I refer to the *British Critic*, for Sept. 1816; to the critique in which, on Bishop Magee's *Postscript*, I have had repeated occasion to refer;—see pp. 16, 19, 325. I find that this Number of the *British Critic*, to which alone I had access while writing the following sheets, forms part of the volume in which Mr. *Valpy's Edition of the Greek Testament* is reviewed. Till I had printed *Appendix D*, I was not acquainted with this article; nor had I any recollection of another, in which *Systematic Education* is reviewed, and represented as a suspicious and insidious production because the authors are Unitarians. I can answer for myself, that my own portion of the work was not written under any controversial bias; and I have every reason to believe that the other portions were not. But a Reviewer deserves no credit for fairness or accuracy, who, in order to indulge the strain of low invective against Mr. Belsham, could represent me as calling his *Elements* “the Principia of Mental Science,” when my reference, vol. ii. p. 318, obviously was, (as any one must have known, who had read the chapters on Mental Philosophy,) to *Hartley's Observations on Man*.

to an examination of what he terms “ the question of Atone-ment.” At times I really gave a groundless degree of credit, *on the faith of his professed quotations*, to some of his most plausible charges ; and knowing that Unitarianism was not answerable for the faults and errors of its advocates, I proposed to make the consideration of his numerous assertions against us a very subordinate and incidental part of my work.

The numerous proofs of unfairness in citation, however, with which Dr. Magee’s *Postscript* abounds, led me to scrutinize, more minutely than I had previously done, various charges against Dr. Priestley, &c., in the preceding volumes ; and I came at last to the conclusion, that it was necessary to examine, more at large, those misrepresentations of the sentiments and arguments of Unitarian Writers, which, from Dr. Magee’s volumes, were propagated so widely and effectually by other Polemics, who had not read our works for themselves, but who detailed his calumnious assertions with the confidence expressed by the Bishop of St. David’s, that Dr. Magee’s was an authority on which they might *rely*.

To this determination I came early in 1818 ; but, from the beginning to the end of the year, I was unable, except occasionally and for a short time, to return again to the subject. Last winter I renewed my undertaking ; and since then I have regularly devoted to it the few hours which I could command in every week, principally after the necessary labours of the day ; and the Reader has now the result before him.

The SECOND PART, to which occasional reference is made in this volume, it is intended to devote exclusively to what

was my first object, which Dr. Magee also originally considered as the main purpose of *his* work. And I here submit to the Reader an *Outline* of my plan.

INQUIRY INTO THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF REDEMPTION.

I. *Mode in which the Controversy ought to be conducted.*

II. *Great Importance of Revelation, as sanctioning the hope of divine forgiveness and acceptance.*

III. *The Jewish Dispensation and Sacrifices, and the Connection between the Jewish and Christian Dispensations.*

IV. *General Principles taught by or immediately deducible from Revelation.*

V. *Various Erroneous or Defective Hypotheses respecting the ends of the Death of Christ.*

VI. *Consideration of the Scriptural Expressions respecting the Death of Christ, and his Agency in effecting the Salvation of Mankind.*

VII. *General Conclusions from the Testimony of Scripture.*

VIII. *Advantages of this View of the Ends of our Saviour's Death.*

It was my hope that both Parts might be comprised in a volume of the same bulk with the present; but I have found it utterly impracticable. For the remaining Part I have made considerable preparation; and two or three months of tolerable leisure would enable me to complete it for publication: but of this I have no prospect; and as the two portions of my work admit of convenient separation, I have judged it advisable not to delay the publication of the present. Two considerations have decided me to this course. The one is, that

I fear I might otherwise be induced to hasten the Second Part too much ; the other, that I wish to separate what will have fewer of the features of controversy from this volume, which, owing to the character of the work to which I reply, is necessarily marked with severe personalities. The two portions of my work, though closely, are not inseparably connected ; and, by the present mode of publication, the purchasers of either Part will be under no obligation to take the other.

Some of my Friends will, I know, be disappointed at the bulk of my volume ; because, as they think, our opponents will not read it. I have better hopes ; but, at any rate, I have done what I could. It would have been easier to write two volumes than this one, which I now send to undergo a severe trial before the tribunal of the Public.

I have spared no labour to make my statements accurate, even in minutiae ; both for my own sake, and, still more, lest my unintentional errors should impede the reception of the important truths which I desire to promote. I cannot hope that I have been uniformly successful :* the constant fatigues

* Having pledged myself (p. 131) to make no quotation throughout this volume, on the authority of another, without express acknowledgment of that authority, I take this opportunity of supplying an omission in the Note in p. 285. I could not find the source of my citations from the Koran ; and the sheet passed through the press without my having the power to add my authority or to examine the Koran for myself. This is still the case ; but those who wish for specific proofs of my statement in opposition to Bishop Magee's, I refer to Dr. Estlin's *Discourses on Final Retitution*, pp. 57—59.

and responsibilities of a school, (to say nothing of other official and private duties,) may have sometimes made me pass by what I should otherwise have detected ; and I well know in what way any little inadvertencies that may be discovered will be treated by those whose misrepresentations I have detected and exposed. I ask from them, however, for no mercy : but I demand justice. Let them quote me as faithfully as I have done them, and be as conscientiously solicitous to avoid misrepresenting my arguments as I have theirs, and I am perfectly satisfied. To mere abuse and acrimonious invective I have been too long accustomed to feel it very painfully.

The views with which I engage in this controversy, I have sufficiently stated in my two Introductory Chapters. I believe that nothing more need be said by way of explanation, than that Bishop Magee's attacks on UNITARIANS are exclusively directed against that large majority of us who hold, in connection with our great common principles, the doctrine of the Simple Humanity of our Lord. My object in this work, as far as respects our doctrinal views, (and also in the tracts referred to in p. 25,) is to defend those doctrines which are most directly opposed to what are usually regarded as orthodox, concerning the character, dispensations, and worship of God, even the Father ; and which, if true, must altogether overturn them : and I have endeavoured, throughout, to preserve these distinct from those theological and metaphysical opinions, which have been considered by our opponents as the essential principles of Unitarianism. But I have always kept in mind, that the Bishop's attacks upon Unitarians are aimed

at those whom he exclusively styles Unitarians; and when considering his charges of general application (Ch. iv.), and of course those referring to individuals, I have taken care to rest my vindication on the ground on which he raises his censures.

There are still many topics of groundless invective, and many instances of great misrepresentation, which I might have adduced; but I believe I have considered most of those which are very essential; and surely enough to prevent the judicious and conscientious opponents of Unitarianism from any longer resting on the authority of Bishop Magee, without themselves examining his quotations, and the evidence for his assertions.

On reviewing, however, the course I have taken in this volume, and comparing it with the notes which I made at the commencement of it, I find that I have passed by some things to which I wished to advert; and I hope for the Reader's excuse in introducing them here.

In stating (Ch. iii.) *what Unitarianism is and what it is not*, I have not adverted to the diversities of opinion among Unitarians, on the subject of *Religious Establishments*; and I had proposed (in Ch. vii.) to consider the representations made by Dr. Magee, as well as by others before him, of Mr. Belsham's expressions in reference to the Established Clergy. On this last point, however, my respected Friend has undertaken his own defence, in the tract mentioned in p. 118; and to p. 45 of that *Letter, &c.*, I refer the Reader; only adding, that in the writings of intelligent Dignitaries of the Established

Church, (for instance, those of Paley and Watson,) are to be found expressions essentially conveying the same opinions as the most obnoxious of Mr. Belsham's.—See Paley's *Mor. Phil.* 11th Ed. vol. ii. p. 320 ; and Watson's *Miscellaneous Tracts*, vol. ii. pp. 49, 50, 63, 75, and 140.

The question of the expediency and influence of a Religious Establishment has no more to do with Unitarianism, than the doctrine of Necessity has, or that of Materialism ; and Unitarians differ very widely on the subject.

There are some, and Mr. Belsham is understood to be in the number, who think that the rites and services of Religion may be well supported by the interference of the State ; and that there is nothing in Christianity which directly opposes the episcopal form of church-government, in all its detail, as existing in the English Establishment. There are many others, and I must class myself with them, who think that, independently of what they regard as objectionable in the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, the principle is radically wrong, which allows the interference of the Civil Magistrate in matters of Religion ; and that all which Religion asks of the State is, that it may be left to itself.

Wise and good men, in as well as out of the Church of England, have seen and lamented the tendency of the honours and wealth exclusively bestowed on those who subscribe to her articles of faith, to mislead men's judgments, to warp their consciences, to check their disposition to search after truth, to make them look with suspicion on those who differ from them, and to induce them to confine their charity and respect to those within their own pale. Numberless instances

indeed occur, in which this tendency is effectually restrained if not altogether prevented, by the liberal spirit of our common Christianity, by the strict principles of duty entertained by the individual himself, by the influence of those extensive associations for the temporal or spiritual welfare of men which draw different parties towards the common centre of Christian love, and by the liberalizing disposition produced by the diffusion of knowledge and the free communication of opinion. Yet the tendency exists, and necessarily attends an exclusive Establishment.

I cordially wish, therefore, that the time may never arrive when the principles of Unitarianism shall be alloyed by admixtures of worldly policy, or rested on the special support of civil authorities. And I doubt not that the period will come, when the support of public worship will be left to every one's own sentiments of its importance to society, and his own appreciation of its value to himself; when no preponderance will be given to any denomination of professing Christians, by exclusively connecting with them civil privileges; when worldly motives will not be mixed with the solemn concerns of religion; and when every one will be equally protected and encouraged in the exercise of the inalienable right and duty of private judgment, and be unbiased by power and interest, to worship the God of his fathers in that way which he deems most accordant with Christian principle. Were I a Trinitarian, I should desire that period as earnestly as I do at present: because I cannot less believe that Christ's kingdom is not of this world.

That period will be accelerated by every instance in which

the gradual yet rapid progress of enlarged and enlightened views is lost sight of; and, on the other hand, it is reasonable to suppose, that it will be retarded by every instance of wise accommodation to the liberal spirit of the times. Were I from conviction a Member of the Church of England, I would aim to promote such accommodation. Truth cannot vary; but the modes of maintaining and promoting it must have some relation to circumstances, or they must be ineffectual.

In Ch. iv. §. 4, *On the Authority of Individuals among Unitarians*, I have given the names (p. 104, 5) of several Anti-trinitarians of different classes, among whom is my late highly respected relative, who was the last of the Arian School that thought it requisite to oppose the believers in the Simple Humanity. My list should have included several others among the strict Unitarians who were eminent for their learning, scriptural investigation, and practical piety; such as *Michael Dodson*, *Henry Moore*, &c.: but I must now leave it as it is. I cannot satisfy myself, however, without stating here, that I ought to have associated with *Robertson*, *Lindsey*, &c., the upright, intrepid, and learned *Evanson*. Nevertheless I cannot do it, (the Readers of the *Discourses* and *Dissertations* will readily perceive why,) without expressing at the same time my dissatisfaction with the mode of inquiry he adopted respecting books of the New Testament, and the conclusions to which it led him. I admire the vigour and acuteness of his understanding, the ardour of his zeal and veneration for what he deemed the truth, the disinterested

integrity of his conduct, his undaunted firmness in the avowal of his convictions, and the piety and benevolence of his life ; but I have never been led by his writings to think highly of the extent or soundness of his critical skill, of the clearness of his conceptions, or the accuracy of his judgment. And with the great and acknowledged excellencies of his intellectual and moral character, I cannot think that he united, what was so essential for the train of inquiry pursued in his *Dissonance*, the habit of patient and correct research, discrimination in the balancing of probabilities, skill in the analyzing of evidence, and sound caution in the formation of his conclusions.

Various references occur in this volume to the productions of Unitarian Writers ; and others will occur in my subsequent Inquiry. I had purposed to give an arranged list of at least the recent publications of Unitarians, with a brief notice of the object of each : but I have been unable to carry it into effect. I may attempt it hereafter, if it should not be undertaken by some one more competent to do it. I must, however, here advert to two publications to which I have repeatedly referred,—the uniform edition, now in progress, of *Dr. Priestley's Theological and Miscellaneous Works*, and the *Monthly Repository*. The able Editor of the former, Mr. Rutt, is rendering the Unitarian body an important though gratuitous service, by the care and accuracy with which he is conducting his laborious undertaking, and the valuable Notes of illustration, correction, and reference, which he adds to those of his Author. It will be well if those who possess this edition will henceforward make their references to it, as well as to Dr.

Priestley's own publications.—The obligations which the Unitarian body are under to the Editor of the *Monthly Repository*, I, among many, feel very sensibly; not only for his own able and important productions, and his long-continued services as Secretary to the Unitarian Fund, but for his indefatigable, persevering, and judicious labours, in conducting that publication, which has, for fourteen years, been the main-spring of that spirit of union and co-operation which is rapidly spreading among Unitarians; and which has in other ways contributed, in an effectual degree, to the knowledge and adoption of our principles, and to the diffusion of religious information among those who had before adopted them.

The mention of the Unitarian Fund brings me to another connected topic which I cannot pass by. The plans of the Fund, as far as they have been carried into effect, have been principally executed by the highly appreciated services of our leading Unitarian Missionary;—I need scarcely say that I refer to Mr. Wright. Exclusively devoting his time and talents to promote a cause which he values as it deserves, and to which he is attached by deep conviction produced by the serious search after truth in the Scriptures of truth, Mr. Wright has contributed, effectively and extensively, to the diffusion of Unitarian principles; and not only for his labours, but for the spirit in which he has engaged in them,—the spirit of Christian love and piety, as well as of steady, judicious, active zeal,—he is entitled to, and I believe possesses, the cordial respect and esteem of every Unitarian who is acquainted with them.

It is to this excellent man, whose Discourses and other writings abound with sentiments truly evangelical, that the following expressions of Bishop Magee, at the close of his *Postscript*, especially relate. “Missionaries there have been, who have encountered much for *the love of Christ*; but that missionaries, calling themselves Christian, should go abroad to work the rejection of *his name*, is a singularity indeed.” “Here we see the followers of a different Lord, going forth to inculcate as the one great maxim, which alone is worthy to be taught, that *there is no Son and no Holy Ghost*.” “Here we see the messengers of another Master, directed to carry with them a *false Gospel*, which, whilst it bears the name, shall more effectually subvert the doctrines of the true Gospel of Christ.” “Here we find teachers, directed to guard against all the danger of *belief*; and to enforce emphatically, as the most important truth, that *he alone shall be saved, who believeth not*.”

I will content myself with referring the Bishop and my Readers to some remarks on a passage of a similar character, in the Note in p. 72; and urging them to examine Mr. Wright’s *Unitarian Missionary Discourses*, especially *Disc. viii.* entitled “CHRIST THE ONLY FOUNDATION.”* If Dr. Magee

* These were published in 1817: but in 1811 Mr. Wright published his *Discourses on Evangelical Subjects*, which also were delivered in the course of his Missionary labours. His *Series of Essays* (1815) entitled *A Plain View of Unitarian Doctrine*, contains most of those tracts through which he had been, and still is, instrumental in sowing effectually the seeds of Unitarianism, far beyond the sphere of his personal labours.

should follow my recommendation, he will perhaps regard it as *imperatively* his DUTY, publicly to retract the injurious and shocking assertions which I have quoted.

Anti-Unitarian publications have of late crowded upon us so rapidly, that it is difficult to keep pace with them. To pass by the more fugitive or unimportant productions, and others (such as the Bishop of Chester's temperate and seasonable Discourse) which I shall have to notice in my *Inquiry*, there have been published, within the last two years, Dr. Hales's two volumes, the first of Dr. Pye Smith's *Scripture Testimony*, (the second of which is announced for publication,) Dean Graves's *Four Discourses*, and now Dr. Nares's *Discourses on the Three Creeds, and on the Homage offered to our Saviour during his Ministry*.

The main part of Dr. PYE SMITH's work is yet to come; but should it require examination, I presume that the able advocate for Unitarianism, against whom it is principally to be directed, will, if he deem it necessary, undertake a reply.

As to Dean GRAVES's *Select Scriptural Proofs of the Trinity*, I have very little to say at present in addition to my Notes in p. 50—54, and p. 129—131. As far as my own criticisms are concerned, (against which his Notes are chiefly directed, and which he regards as completely unsatisfactory if not frivolous, and as continually marked by the error of begging the question,) unless any unforeseen circumstances should require me to examine them separately, I hope to find a suitable opportunity (see p. 321) of noticing all his strictures that really require it. In the mean time I beg to refer his

Readers, especially "the Students," to those works which show the basis on which the Unitarian rests his interpretations of the Trinitarian's proofs; and as Dr. Graves points out to them Mr. WARDLAW's *Discourses* and his *Reply to Mr. Yates*, I earnestly urge them to peruse, calmly and cautiously, Mr. YATES's *Reply to the Discourses* and his *Sequel*. It does not seem to be the system of the "King's Professor of Divinity in Trinity College, Dublin," to direct "the Students who attend his Lectures" to read both sides of the question, and judge for themselves; but I can assure them that it is a very salutary exercise both of the intellectual and of the moral powers, and quite indispensable in their search after truth.

On the main point which Dean Graves has in view, this able Writer, who has manifested so much judgment on subjects connected with the evidences of Revelation, has shown himself unequal to the great question at issue between the Unitarians and Trinitarians. How he can suppose his work to contain *proofs* of the TRINITY, I know not; and I suspect that the Eclectic Reviewer, in his recent critique on the *Select Proofs*, found the same difficulty. Dr. Graves dwells greatly on the miraculous powers of our Lord: where is the Unitarian who would say less, except as it respects the *source* of those powers? And is the Dean prepared to deny the Unitarian's position, that *our Lord wrought all his mighty works by the power of the FATHER*?—I regard Dr. Graves's arguments and positions on this subject, as a clear proof that he has derived at least his *impression* of Unitarianism from the writings of Bishop Magee, Dr. Hales, and other opponents, of it.

Dr. NARES knows more of us ; and yet even he expresses (*Disc.* p. 140) great surprise at a remark of Dr. Priestley's in reference to our Lord's stilling the storm,—viz. “ That a “ perfect calm should immediately follow the command of “ Jesus *must have implied*, that *his word* was accompanied “ with the same power that *originally made* both the sea and “ dry land—His power who spake and it was done, who com- “ manded and all things stood fast.” Had this able Critic forgotten the declaration of St. Peter (Acts ii. 22)? ‘ Ye men of Israel, hear these words ; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles and wonders and signs which GOD DID, *by him*, in the midst of you.’—The case is, the *Unitarian*, following implicitly the express declarations of his Lord, refers his mighty works, and all that distinguished him, and that will hereafter distinguish him, as the *Son of God*, to the power of GOD THE FATHER ; and the *Trinitarian*, influenced (as we think) by human symbols of faith, refers them to HIS OWN inherent power as GOD THE SON :

I cannot think that Dr. Nares's late work will advance his reputation as a Theologian. That he should repeatedly appeal to *Hume's* “ testimony,” against all arguments *à priori* for the unity of God, surely indicates a want of *proof* that “ three distinct persons or beings may be in the exercise of Divine Omnipotence ;” and, before any stress was laid upon such an opinion, it should have been shown that the sceptical philosopher had no insidious objects in view, and that his reasonings in support of it were well-founded.

That Dr. Nares should himself maintain (p. 333) that “ the Unitarians have not wit enough to discover the inconsistency

of their proceedings," and that *by denying the deity of our Lord they fix upon him the charge of being "a perfect deceiver,"*—and that he should adopt (p. 58) the sentiment of *Fleury*, that if we "*renounce the worship of Christ,*" we consequently renounce "*the name of Christians,*" and (p. 169) that of "*a most sensible, pious, and acute writer of a sister-kingdom,*" that the Unitarians must view Jesus Christ "*as a very bad man,*"—does not afford the pleasing conviction, that his charity increases with his zeal for the Athanasian Creed, and with his growing obligations (see the Dedication) to the Earl of Liverpool.

Passing by Dr. Nares's curious mistake (p. 269) as to an illustration of mine, (to which he gives, however, no specific reference, and the same is the case with various other quotations against us,)—and his much more essential error (p. 320) when he actually declares that I rest my argument for Unitarianism "*chiefly on the silence of the first three Evangelists in regard to any superior nature in Christ, and of the Apostles in their first preaching, as recorded in the book of Acts,*" which is a most unfounded position, and what every one who has read the whole of my second *Letter to Mr. Veysie*, to which Dr. Nares refers, (or, which is the same thing, ch. ii. and iii. of *Unitarianism &c.*) should know to be unfounded,—I take the freedom, in connection with one main object of his recent work, to solicit Dr. Nares's consideration of a little Tract, entitled *Proof from Scripture*, in which are examined the arguments advanced by Dr. Pye Smith, in his *Discourse on the Adoration of Christ*.

I should cheerfully examine those of Dr. Nares. I cannot

perceive, however, that he has added any thing on the subject to what has been adduced by his predecessors, and repeatedly considered by the Unitarians : and I must now proceed to the last object of my Preface, to undertake which I am under a private engagement to the Rector of Killesandra.

When Dr. Hales, with unusual courtesy, presented me, in the spring of 1818, with a copy of his recent publication, I gave him reason, in my letter of acknowledgment, to expect that, in my Reply to Bishop Magee, I should have occasion to notice his work. I had despaired of accomplishing my purpose, further than by occasional references in this volume ;— such as that in p. 402, to his retractation of his former opinion, that the passage respecting the Three Heavenly Witnesses is spurious ; and stating my intention (as in p. 321) of considering, when I reprint my former work, the arguments which he and other recent Critics have advanced, so far as they appear to me to affect my interpretations of the texts commonly adduced in support of popular opinions. I have availed myself, however, of some unexpected delays in the publication of this volume, to reconsider Dr. Hales's work ; and I shall here offer a few cursory observations upon it. It would be very easy to extend them ; but I see no reason to expect that his volumes will be considered as having any weight in the controversy. When our Orthodox opponents so represent them, it will be time enough for the Unitarian to undertake the refutation of them.

Dr. Hales represents his recent work, entitled *Faith in the Holy Trinity the Doctrine of the Gospel, and Sabellian Unitarianism shown to be " the God-denying Apostacy,"*

as originating in the “*petty Exeter Controversy* between “*Dr. Carpenter, and Amicus Patriæ, Christianus Biblicus,* “&c. &c.” (*Pref.* p. x.) I suspect that his reverend brethren of the Establishment, Prebendary *Dennis*, Mr. (now Dr.) *Cleeve*, and Mr. *Carne*, will not thank him for this summary designation of the Controversy. If Dr. Hales should examine the publication containing it, he will find that he was very little acquainted with it when he wrote his own Letters in the *Anti-Jacobin Review*. The following brief account will give a more correct idea of it.

Amicus Patriæ, a profane enemy of the Unitarians, inserted in the Exeter Newspapers a calumnious advertisement, offering to give away Bishop Burgess’s *Address to Unitarians*. Not knowing the source of the advertisement, I laid before the Public, through the same channel, a summary of the opinions prevalent among Unitarians; which, with some additions and alterations, has been very extensively circulated, under the title of the *Unitarian’s Appeal*. From this time *Amicus Patriæ* continued, during some months, occasionally inserting his illiterate nonsense; but, with the exception of one instance, (where he had been confounding *Thomas Belsham*, the Minister of Essex-street Chapel, with *William Belsham* the Historian, and *David Eaton*, the Unitarian Bookseller, with *Daniel Isaac Eaton* the Publisher of deistical and seditious pamphlets,) he was regarded by friends and foes as utterly undeserving of notice. His curiosities formed no part of the *Controversy*; and with some other Letters abounding in gross personal calumny, equally foreign to the Controversy, they were omitted in the separate publication.

This contains, besides my own letters, those of Dr. Cleeve, which are marked by low abuse and narrow-minded bigotry ;*

* This Divine has recently distinguished himself by his Sermon on the opening of four Churches in Exeter for an evening-service, entitled, *A Caution against the frequenting the Meeting-Houses of Dissenters*. In this notable effort to bring back the wanderers from the Establishment, (of which his respectable and liberal brethren must be abundantly ashamed,) Dr. Cleeve represents it as “a species “of idolatry,” “a solemn mockery,” “a gross contradiction in “prayer and practice, in the morning in the Established Church “to pray—‘from heresy and schism, good Lord deliver us,’—and “then regularly in the evening of the same day to attend the con- “venticles of Heretics and Schismatics !” He declares that “these “self-appointed and self-constituted intruders,” Dissenting Mi- nisters, “have no authority to preach at all ; and, consequently, “that their ministrations must be null and inefficient.” Of course, he and others episcopally ordained are circumstanced very differ- ently ; and whether God “speaks by his own blessed mouth imme- “diately from heaven, or by the mouths of his duly constituted “and rightly ordained ministers on earth, the same attention is “due, and his message is to be received with the same reverential “awe.” As might be expected, he adverts to the “conventicle “of the blasphemous Socinians, or, as they arrogantly style “themselves, Unitarians ;” and he asserts, that “a man can as “easily take fire in his bosom and not be burnt, as *hear* these “‘damnable heresies’ and not be injured.”—By such alarming and authoritative representations, many will, undoubtedly, be spell-bound : but as this “duly constituted and rightly ordained” Minister has not denounced the *reading* of what they might have heard there, I recommend to their perusal, the able, judicious, and seasonable *Sermon on Heresy and Schism*, containing strictures in reply to Dr. Cleeve’s *Caution*, by my greatly esteemed friend and successor, the Rev. William Hincks,—whose virtues, talents, and acquirements will, I trust, be increasingly and extensively useful in promoting our great common objects.—I learn that the Minis- ter of the Wesleyan Methodists is also contributing to check this

those of Prebendary *Dennis*, which display more talent, but are filled with sophistry and the misrepresentations of an intolerant spirit,—of which the Reader may see some specimens in this volume (pp. 70, 88); and others by various anonymous Writers, among which were those of *Christianus Biblicus*. Mr. *Carne* began his attack when the Controversy had already pressed too long on the public attention; and his Letters were left, almost unnoticed, to carry their own refutation along with them. For the benefit of those who might wish to read them, Mr. *Carne* printed them in a separate publication, containing some additional specimens of that low personal abuse, with which he and Dr. *Cleeve* saw fit to *grace* and *support* their cause. I suspect that they never received the thanks of any liberal and enlightened persons on the same side of the question.*

spirit of dark bigotry; and I doubt not that the result will be, an important extension of respect for the rights of conscience, and of the disposition to exercise the duty of private judgment.

* I am persuaded that they did not from my first clerical opponent, the Rev. DANIEL VEYSIE, B.D., whose urbanity and general equity and candour formed a striking contrast with the low abuse and scurrilous misrepresentation which, during the Exeter Trinitarian Controversy, were copiously employed against me.

My greatly respected opponent has for some years been numbered with the pious dead: but his works still live; and I do not hesitate to refer to his *Bampton Lectures on the Atonement*, in reply to Dr. Priestley's *History of the Corruptions of Christianity*, and even to his *Defence of the Preservative*, as more important in the Unitarian Controversy, than the Bishop of Raphoe's ill-digested volumes. I shall hereafter have occasion to notice some of his arguments and criticisms respecting the Atonement, which appear

Amicus Patriæ, in his untutored zeal, sent to the Anti-Jacobin some of his own productions, with one or more, I think, of my own, a Letter of *Christianus Biblicus*, and perhaps another or two. These led Dr. Hales to insert a series of Letters which I saw as they came out. In his *Faith in the Holy Trinity*, (which is spoken of, surely erroneously, as the "Second Edition,") these Letters are *recast*, and extensive additions made to them: I had written that they are *digested*; but the work really presents no appearance of this from beginning to end.* Of the *Royal, Most Reverend, Right*

to me inconsistent with scriptural truth: but the almost invariable good temper, the upright accuracy of statement, and the perspicuous reasonings of the Author, might furnish a useful specimen of controversial style, to those clerical opponents of Unitarianism, who have, so unadvisedly, selected a model as destitute of fairness as it is of Christian spirit.

Were not my Preface extending beyond all usual bounds, I would present my Readers with the conclusion of Mr. Veysie's *Defence*, not more as interesting to myself, than as a tribute of respectful esteem to the memory of the worthy Prebendary: but I have already had an opportunity of offering such a tribute, by entering my name as a Subscriber to his Works, recently announced for publication in a collected form. The manner in which it was received by the Rev. FRANCIS HUISH, who conducts the publication, while it is most gratifying to myself personally, is highly interesting, as one among the numerous proofs which have occurred to my own knowledge, that a firm attachment to the doctrines, discipline, and worship of the Church of England, need not interrupt the exercise of courteousness and liberality towards those who separate from it, and conscientiously oppose its fundamental peculiarities.

* Dr. Hales tells us, in his Preface (p. vi.), that the recommendation of his Friends induced him,—“to divest each Letter, as

Reverend, and Noble Personages, whose names grace his subscription-list, it may reasonably be conjectured that those who have read his work, with the "exercise of private judgment," which Dr. Hales permits (vol. i. p. 68) under "wise and discreet restrictions," will be disposed to allow, that, though there are abundant proofs of his honest convictions, his earnest zeal, and his extensive reading, and of his possessing an immense mass of theological, critical, and chronological erudition, there are few indications of clear discrimination and comprehensiveness of thought, of logical arrangement and mathematical precision, and of that soundness of judgment which weighs accurately and carefully, and which decides, not by narrow views or temporary impressions, but by a calm

"much as possible, of its original controversial air: avoiding all personal applications and sarcasms, unbecoming the dignity and gravity of the subject." I do not think he has been successful. "Nothing (he says, vol. i. p. 239) can exceed the *miserable, absurd, and revolting* SUBTERFUGES of Dr. Carpenter and the whole Unitarian School." Dr. C.'s "object evidently was, to degrade the Oracle to a mere man; and for this *he has not scrupled to FALSIFY the sacred text.*" (i. 281)—"Dr. C. is remarkable (ii. 251) for his positive and dogmatical assertions; his 'irrefragable proof' turns out to be 'nothing in the world' but the idol of his own imagination, downright vanity in him, and 'vexation of spirit' to his rational and religious readers." In p. 258 he speaks of Dr. C.'s "strange obliquity of intellect;" and in the preceding, he says, "Such is the miserable and blasphemous absurdity resulting from Dr. C.'s assumption, betraying total ignorance of the first elements of logic."—I think I have brought evidence enough to show, that he has not acted up to the "recommendation" of the "highly respectable friends," to whom he refers in his Preface.

deliberate examination and appreciation of the whole evidence, and according to that evidence.

Here and there we find criticisms which will stand examination; and many more which afford materials for thinking, and may assist in leading others right: and I have been often interested in the ardour and earnestness of the Author, ~~where~~ I am satisfied he is quite wrong. But his confidence in arguments which can influence none but those who *will* be convinced,—without any investigation of objections which may be urged against them, or examination of the other side of the question,*—and his utter inability to allow any weight to that which opposes (what for the time are) his own convictions, together with the great crudity of his thoughts, and the diffuse excursive-ness of his reasonings, must prevent his gaining much reputation in the fields of controversy. The character of his mind raises him above the imposing sophistry which so continually disgraces the pages of the Bishop of Raphoe; and it is not likely that his work will reach that eminence which, principally by such means, the *Discourses* and *Dissertations* have

* This strikes me forcibly in his reference (i. 81) to “*Hales's New Analysis of Chronology*, vol. i. p. 189—192,” to *prove* that St. Luke reckons the fifteenth year of Tiberius from the time when he assumed the proconsular government in conjunction with Augustus. A reference to *Lardner* would have been much more to the purpose, by whom the subject has been really discussed, and with as much of proof as the case admits; though, in my judgment, (as I have stated, p. 300,) without success: but Dr. Hales has not added one argument to those of Lardner, and seems to think that his own assertion of conviction must satisfy every one that he has solid ground for it.

XXX DR. HALES'S MISREPRESENTATIONS.

attained. Till a more particular notice of Dr. Hales is required, I refer those who may think highly of his work, to the publications mentioned in Note †, p. 23, &c.

I doubt not from error of mind and not of heart, Dr. Hales follows, however, the footsteps of his predecessor, in the course of false quotation and misrepresentation. He represents Dr. Carpenter (i. 29) as *admitting* (what Dr. C. never did admit) that "*Sabellian Unitarians*, or Modern Sabellians" is "the proper title of the party." The only reason he assigns is, that Dr. C. speaks of the Sabellian Scheme "as Unitarianism under a different name, and using different language." Who would suppose that Dr. Hales is a profound Mathematician?—With still less reason, if possible, he declares (ii. 333) that I have "ignorantly misrepresented" the *first, second, and fifth* Articles of the Established Church, as *savouring of Sabellianism*. I have consulted the pages of *Unitarianism* &c., which he refers to, (viz. pp. 28, 60, 142,) but I can discern nothing even *resembling* the ignorant misrepresentation laid to my charge. The nearest approximation to resemblance is, I fancy, in p. 142, where I state my opinion, from which I see no reason to depart, that "if *ideas* are attached to the words employed, Trinitarianism is, in reality, either Tritheism or Sabellianism."—In vol. i. p. 114—117, Dr. Hales founds some curious reasoning on two positions; (1) That I agree with "*philosophizing divines*," in "resolving the whole *historical* account of" the Fall, &c. "given by Moses, into *vision, allegory, parable, or moral fable*:" and (2) That I represent the Trinitarian as resting his belief in Satan on poetic imagery or popular belief, and as attributing to him all his

evil thoughts, &c. Now I cannot find that I have any where expressed an opinion on the Mosaic account of the Fall ; and as to the second point I do not say, in reference to the *Trinitarian*, what the Rector of Killesandra QUOTES as my words. Let the Reader judge.

After adverting to the three great principles of Unitarianism, (see p. 22 of this volume,) I proceed as follows, in my Reply to Prebendary Dennis :—

“ If a man hold these three fundamental principles, whatever other not inconsistent opinions he connect with them, he is a Unitarian. If, for instance, under the direct or indirect influence of Milton’s poetic imagery and the popular belief, he [the *Unitarian* obviously] attribute all his evil thoughts to Satanic agency, (unless indeed he go further, and regard Satan as independent of the Almighty, and perpetually employed in resisting his authority,) he is still a Unitarian. His error I should think likely to do him some moral injury ; but I should not expect it to continue long,” &c.—*Exeter Controversy*, Part III. p. 38.

Dr. Hales quotes this passage exactly as follows :—

“ Under the direct or indirect influence of *Milton’s poetic imagery*, and *popular belief*, he (the *Trinitarian*) regards *Satan* as a personage independent on the ALMIGHTY, and perpetually employed in resisting his authority ; and he attributes, with some *Unitarians* also, all his evil thoughts to *Satanic agency*. His error [in the latter case] I should think likely to do him some *moral injury* ; but I should not think it likely to continue long,” &c.—*Faith in the Holy Trinity*, vol. i. p. 114.

Dr. Hales speaks (i. 231) of Dr. Carpenter's "*usual iniquity of quotation*:" may I be allowed, (with a cheerful consciousness that I never *knowingly* withheld or altered any evidence against me,) to refer Dr. Hales to Matt. vii. 3?

So much for the learned Rector's accuracy of citation. His criticisms are not all as bad as the following; but I cite these to show how hasty and inconsiderate he often is. He regards ΔΕΣΠΟΤΑ (*sovereign Lord*) in Luke ii. 29, as meaning the HOLY GHOST, because (i. 109) "*his revelation to Simeon is expressed by 'THY word' and 'THY salvation.'*" Among other passages cited to show that the New Testament Writers employ γινομαι in the sense of *creating* (i. 254), he adduces Phil. ii. 7, as a proof that St. PAUL *clearly used it in this sense*, when he said that Christ Jesus was '*made (γενομενος) in the likeness of men;*' a citation which involves heretical notions from which this Orthodox Divine would without a doubt shrink back with horror. And to crown all, he adopts (ii. 340) "*as a well-founded and highly probable theory,*" "*subversive of the Sabellian heresy, both ancient and modern,*" "*and rationally supporting the mysterious doctrine of the*" "*TRINITY IN UNITY,*" "*the prevailing opinion, not only of*" "*the Jewish rabbins, but also of the early heretics, Simon*" "*Magus, Manes, Mahomet, &c.,*" "*recently revived, and*" "*ably supported by Heber in his instructive Bampton.*" "*Lectures, 1816,*"—viz. "*The IDENTITY of GABRIEL and*" "*the HOLY GHOST.*" Few judicious Trinitarians can seek for such *supports* of their "*mysterious doctrine;*" and as to the Unitarian, his principle is, OTHER FOUNDATION CAN NO MAN LAY THAN THAT IS LAID, WHICH IS JESUS CHRIST.' 1 Cor. iii. 11.

Dr. Hales's system of textual criticism would involve every thing in the utmost uncertainty. He commends Stephens (ii. 19) for making the *INTERNAL evidence* for a reading, the chief ground of preference; and it is certainly on this principle, at the same time assuming as an infallible standard the doctrines of the Established Church, that he proceeds in forming his own decisions. Now this is, virtually, *conjectural criticism*.*—But there are various positions which he maintains without any discoverable foundation: among others (ii. 26), that, while *Mill, Wetstein, Griesbach, &c.*, have “raked together” only about “*four hundred manuscripts*,” those Scholars, who lived about the era of the invention of printing, had access to “full as *many thousands*, and in a more perfect state of preservation.”—Dr. Hales is so fond of censuring the Editors of the Improved Version, that he charges them (ii. 12) with “arrogantly representing the original Editors,” viz. of the Complutensian edition, “as *fools and knaves*,” because these “calumniators of this immortal edition” say, “without shame or fear of detection,” “that ‘the various manuscripts employed therein, which were then

* I have said, in p. 416, that it is the business of the advocates for the “gross interpolation” in 1 John v. 7, 8, to confute Griesbach's *Diatribes*. Dr. Hales undertakes the examination of it; but without even the appearance of success. If the Bishop of Peterborough, or even the Bishop of Lincoln, or any other Orthodox Critic of cool judgment, not (like the Bishop of St. David's and the Rector of Killesandra) under the influence of a “predominant terror,” should publicly declare himself convinced by Dr. Hales's arguments, I venture to pledge myself to show cause why others should not take this retrograde course.

XXXIV. DR. HALES CENSURES THE IMPROVED VERSION.

‘*thought to be great authority, are now known to have been of little value.*’ ”—“ Known, (says Dr. Hales,) by whom ? ”—“ By *themselves*, forsooth.” Had the learned Rector forgotten the information afforded by that Divine who holds the first rank among our English Critics ?—viz. that *Semler* and *Wetstein* both maintained that the text of the Complutensian Greek Testament is of little value, and that *Griesbach* accedes to this opinion, and says, *Complutenses non habuerunt codices Græcos, nisi paucos, recentes, exigui fere, si ad lectionum bonitatem spectes, pretii.* (*Marsh’s Michaelis*, vol. ii. p. 844.)—Surely Dr. Hales will not again ask “ By whom ? ”*

* I beg leave to refer the Reader to Ch. viii. and the Appendix, where I have considered the charges so often made, and so strongly reiterated by Dr. Hales, against the Improved Version, as *deceptive, insidious, a gross imposition, &c. &c.*, and even as arbitrarily receding from Griesbach’s text, “ whenever it militates against their system ; ”—in connection with which last charge, Dr. Hales says, vol. i. p. 78, with *Italics*, &c. as I here quote the passage, “ Thus, *Judas-like*, do they ‘ betray their *professed* friends with a ‘ kiss,’ and then ‘ hang themselves!!! ’ ”—That *seven thousand* copies of the three contemporaneous editions of 1808, had been sold before 1818, (as Dr. Hales informs his Readers, on the authority of “ Mr. *Hunter*, the Unitarian Bookseller, St. Paul’s Church-yard,”) is a proof that there are many who do not view it, like Dr. Hales, as “ another Gospel,” *fabricated* by those who are “ preaching ‘ another Jesus.’ ”

Dr. Hales selects John i. 1—18 as a “ specimen ” to show “ how widely this Improved Version recedes from Archbishop Newcome’s.” This selection might have been expected ; though it would have been well also to have *added* some such facts as those which I have stated in p. 307. But in this specimen Dr. Hales marks *five* deviations from Newcome as “ unnoticed.” How can these learned Divines go on to urge their charges, on examination

Dr. Hales is, I trust, equally forgetful, if not ignorant, of Whitby's *Last Thoughts* (see p. 326 of this volume). In vol. ii. p. 291, he cites that upright Critic, as referring 1 John v. 20, to the Son. In the *Last Thoughts*, Whitby expressly retracts the interpretation. I will cite the passage :—

“ That the *true God* mentioned 1 John v. 20, is not the Son of God but the Father, who by our Saviour is styled the only true God, is proved from the ancient reading of these words, thus, *The Son of God is come, and hath given us an*

so careless? What more easy than to collate eighteen verses with accuracy?—Dr. Hales marks the following as “ *unnoticed deviations.*” (1) *Ver. 4. I. V. By him was life: N. In him.* (2) *Ver. 12. I. V. authority to be the children of God: N. power to become.* (3) *Ver. 14. I. V. full of kindness and truth: N. favour.* (4) *Ver. 17. I. V. favour and truth were by Jesus Christ: N. came.* (5) *Ver. 15. I. V. and cried: N. (as cited by Dr. Hales) “ Gr. ‘ crieth.’ ”* —“ Of these five,” says Dr. Hales, No. 1 and 2 “ are important.” The first is really important; but it is REGULARLY NOTICED in the *Improved Version*; “ ‘ In him was life,’ Newcome.” And what is further remarkable, No. 5 actually gives, as an “ *unnoticed deviation* ” from Newcome, one of the innumerable instances in which the *Improved Version* follows Newcome.

If, in collating only eighteen verses, Dr. Hales makes two such remarkable errors, he ought not to rate too highly the culpability of the Editors in their much more venial errors.

The Reader will find, on consulting *App. A.*, that I have not inserted No. 3 in my *Specification*. On examining the MS. collation, I find that though the variations in *ver. 14* are given, the change of *favour* into *kindness* is not marked as *unnoticed*. This is the only error in the collation which I have ever discovered.—It may be mentioned, as a matter of critical interpretation, that Archbp. Newcome explains *χαριτες* “ *graciousness or benignity.*” This last I prefer to *kindness*.

XXXVI PLAIN IMPORT OF JOHN XVII. 3 REJECTED.

understanding, ἵνα γινωσκωμεν τον αληθινον Θεον, that we may know the true God, και εσμεν εν τω αληθινω υἱω αυτου Ιησου Χριστου, and we are in his true Son Jesus Christ. This God, of whom the Son of God hath given us this knowledge, (as our Lord hath told us, John xvii. 3,) is the true God, and the knowledge of him is eternal life. Thus the Disciple accords well with his Master, and only teacheth what he had learnt from him.—*Last Thoughts*, p. 85.

If a Unitarian had made such a reference, the Bishop of Raphoe would have called it “a gross falsification” of his authority.

Whitby regards his interpretation as showing that “the Disciple accords well with his Master :” Dr. Hales considers the Master’s words as according with the modern interpretation of his Disciple’s. He labours much (ii. 288—301) to show that when our Lord addressed the FATHER in prayer as the ONLY TRUE GOD, he did not mean to exclude himself, the SON, or the HOLY GHOST. The attempt is a bold one, but necessary for his purpose : it is as fruitless as it is bold. His whole structure of criticism is really thrown to the ground by one simple remark of his own (ii. 299) on Rom. xvi. 27 ; where he says that the appropriation of μονω σοφω Θεω (to the Only Wise God) to the FATHER, “is evident from the adjunct δια Ιησου Χριστου” (through Jesus Christ).* We say

* I cannot help supposing that even now the learned Rector is not quite reconciled to the Athanasian Creed. In vol. ii. p. 300, after quoting some of our decisive passages, he says, “From this “association of luminous texts, we learn that THE FATHER is pre-“eminently the fountain of all ‘truth, wisdom, goodness, sove-

the same respecting John xvii. 3. My full conviction is, that no "twisting" and "straining" on the part of the Unitarian, to show the consistency of the Trinitarian's scriptural evidence with his own belief, can possibly equal that to which the Trinitarian is reduced, when he attempts to prove that the SON is *Omniscient*, though he himself declared that he did not know the time when his own prophecies would be accomplished (*Mark* xiii. 32); that the SON is *Omnipotent*, though he declared that of himself he could do nothing (*John* v. 30); and that the SON is '*the true God*,' though our Lord, in PRAYER to his God and Father, addressed HIM as the ONLY TRUE GOD,—and this *exclusively of himself*, for he immediately speaks of himself as the person SENT *by the Only True God*.

"reignty, power, and immortality;" where as the Creed says, "In this Trinity none is afore or after another." However, Dr. Hales makes an addition which better agrees with the Creed, though, as far as I understand the force of words, it essentially contradicts his own grand and scriptural conclusion just stated: it is as follows: "While from the whole tenor of Scripture it likewise, appears, that these perfections are *equally* possessed by THE SON OF HIS LOVE, Col. i. 13, and by THE SPIRIT OF TRUTH, which *proceedeth* from the Father; John xv. 26."—In the same opening, Dr. Hales speaks of the "heinousness and enormity of the crime of *infidelity*, or denial of the divinity of JESUS as THE TRUE GOD," and represents it as involving "the crime of *atheism* also," and as "downright *rebellion* against God himself;" referring us to 1 Sam. viii. 7: which, he says, "furnishes, surely, a most awful subject of consideration to *Deists* in general, and to *Sabellian Unitarians* in particular." This is only one among the many instances in which Dr. Hales ranks the Unitarian with the Deist. I submit to his consideration, Ch. iv. §. 2, of the following work.

Dr. Hales appears to have a mind which was not intended to be trammelled. There are often indications of a genuine spirit of free inquiry; but he seems to feel what he expresses (i. 77) in reference to Archbishop Newcome, when he speaks of some of the renderings of the Improved Version as “subversive of that *doctrine*, which the *Archbishop* was “bound, under the most solemn obligations, to maintain.” Whatever obligations he or any other Clergyman of the Established Church is under, (and I think they are great and imperative,) to leave that Church, if convinced that its faith and worship are unscriptural, he can be under none whatever to maintain its doctrines, except so far as he is seriously and deliberately convinced that they are the doctrines of the Gospel.—Under what restraints Dr. Hales places himself, and wishes to place others, may be inferred from the following singular passage: “No serious and sober-minded *searcher* “after TRUTH, indeed, will ever dare to set up his *private* “judgment, his individual opinion, on *fundamental* points, “(such as the stupendous *mysteries* of CREATING, REDEEMING, “SANCTIFYING LOVE,) in opposition to the collective judgment, “the prevailing opinion, of the *Fathers of the Church*, from “the *Apostolic* age down to the present day; ‘lest, being “‘puffed up with pride, he fall into the condemnation and “snare of the devil.’ ” (Vol. i. p. 67.) The Unitarian prefers the authority of the Apostles of Christ, who say, ‘Prove all things,’ and, ‘Try the spirits.’ (1 *Thess.* v. 21; 1 *John* iv. 1.)

Of course Dr. Hales wishes the right of publication restrained. The “strange and perverse acquittals” of W. Hone obviously affect his mind (*Pref.* xvii) with distressful

alarm.—*Parodies* of any devotional compositions are always highly reprehensible, and may be highly criminal ; and I can see nothing but mischief which could arise from those to which Dr. Hales refers. Even the Athanasian Creed, as long as it forms a part of the religious services of the Church of England, should not be submitted to *such* an ordeal. Dr. Hales must, however, derive some comfort from the recent convictions of Carlile, and from the new enactments of the Legislature, for which he expresses himself, at the close of his Preface, as earnestly solicitous. Were it *possible* to draw a definite line between indecent ridicule and abuse, and the strong and earnest representations of serious conviction,—and to check the profligate immoral selfish attack upon the Christian's belief, without giving the power of restraining the conscientious endeavour to promote what the individual regards as truth, and to overturn what he believes to be injurious error,—the system of the person now suffering under the penal enactments of the Law, (avowedly influenced as he was, in carrying on his gainful trade, by the unfounded belief that Mr. Smith's Bill placed him under the protection of the Law,) and his wild and absurd attacks, during his trials, on the best feelings and principles of those who were to decide his condemnation, might have led me at least to modify the principles laid down in the Note in p. 29, which was written in the middle of 1819. Believing that to draw such a line is impossible, I am constrained to leave them as they are, with some limitation in their application.* I cannot conscientiously

* The Attorney General, and still more decidedly the Lord Chief
d 2

withdraw that note however unpopular it may prove even among Unitarians : but I alone am answerable for it.

Dr. Hales, Bishop Burgess, and others, desire to retain the power of the Law, and I fear even to direct its vindictive arm, against Unitarians also. I hope the former does not consider *our* interpretations to be *quite* so profane and seditious as Hone's Parodies; but he calls my explanation of St. John's Proem (i. 288) an "*idle and audacious PARODY*;" and he represents (i. 70) our increased zeal and activity, as "*most*" "*awfully alarming, and deplorable, if considered in a national*" "*light; threatening, alas! to ALIENATE THE AFFECTIONS OF*" "*THE GREAT MASS OF OUR POPULATION, from the established*" "*Church and worship, as superstitious and idolatrous, and*" "*from the STATE and GOVERNMENT which upholds and main-*" "*tains it, as OPPRESSIVE and TYRANNICAL*; and, in fine, to "*unchristianize the land, and eventually to draw down the*

Justice, (whose conduct on the trial of Carlile appears to have been marked by dignity and forbearance,) obviously were of opinion that the penalties of the Law should be enforced, only where the Christian's faith is insulted and his feelings wounded, by the abusive language of contumelious ridicule; and they certainly endeavoured to guard against the application of their principles to the controversies among Christians. But again I ask, who is to draw the line?

Regarding the late prosecution as mainly intended to restrain the spirit of ribaldry and licentious falsehood with which Christianity has been assailed, I must protest against the application of the whole of my censure in the Note above mentioned to the Prosecutors of Mr. Carlile. I cannot venture to impugn their *motives*, while I condemn the course to which these have led them.

*“vengeance of Heaven, upon the hypocrites and apostates,
“when the measure of their iniquity shall come to the full !”*

Is it unreasonable to suppose that the wild alarm which this passage manifests, and in which Bishop Burgess fully partakes with Dr. Hales, would, if the power were placed in their hands, induce these two Divines, (through a mistaken regard to the glory of God and the temporal and everlasting welfare of mankind,) at least to banish from the land of our Fathers, those of us—and there are many—who would not be deterred by human penalties from going on in that work of religious reformation which, we feel assured, must precede the diffusion of the Gospel throughout all nations? Assuredly there *are* others, who, from less worthy motives, (we see reason in their writings against us to conclude,) would gladly trample down, by human authority, that which they cannot overpower by argument.—May God forgive them, and turn their hearts! But let them remember, that if our counsel and our work be of God, they cannot overthrow it.

It is our serious and steady conviction that it is of God : and we feel the force of the solemn principle, that we must obey God rather than Man. Those who believe that they are in possession of Christian truth, must do what they can to disseminate it, by every means which benevolent prudence dictates, and which Providence enables them to execute : they must ‘earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints :’ nor must selfish worldly motives prevent those who feel this to be their duty from engaging, actively and faithfully, in the performance of it. The Bishop of St. David’s, and those who partake in his terrors, are widely

mistaken if they imagine that the passing of Mr. Smith's Bill produced that zeal and energy which rouses their fears. *Before* that judicious and conscientious Senator, by his perseverance, moderation, and good sense, gave its recent direction to the liberal spirit of the Legislature and the Government, Unitarians had pursued their course, heedless of the well-known penalties of the Law : and now that we learn, from the legal opinions of Sir Samuel Romilly, the present Attorney General, and the Lord Chief Justice, that we are as much as ever under the ban of the Law, we shall go on, equally regardless of the precariousness of our rights, doing all we can, consistently with truth and duty, to promote what we conscientiously and firmly regard as the cause of Christian faith and practice.

While I deeply regret the existence, among many of our theological opponents, of that intolerant spirit which would have best suited the times of Mary and Elizabeth and Charles the Second, I should do injustice to my own views and feelings, if I did not advert to the rapidly extending regard to the Sacred Rights of Conscience and the cause of Religious Liberty. Among those who regret the progress of Unitarianism, and view it with sincere but unfounded abhorrence, there are multitudes who would on no account interfere with our exercise of those rights which they themselves claim, and which they believe to be inalienable and not under human authority. And out of the Established Church, and, still more, I think, within its pale, there is a growing spirit of liberality, which, if it do not degenerate into indifference,—much more baneful to the progress and efficacy of Christian principles than some

mixture of bigotry with a zealous attachment to what is apprehended to be the truth,—will leave the way more and more open to an unbiassed conscientious examination of the Scriptures of Truth: and *this* must lead, in proportion as their simple influences are experienced,* to love all, as Brethren in Christ, who show, by their lives and conversation, that they love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity,—to give thanks, *always*, for *all* things, unto GOD, even the FATHER, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ,—to HIM, in *every thing*, by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving, to make known their desires,—to love HIM with supreme affection,—and, (to include every branch of the Christian's duty,) by doing every thing, in word and in deed, *in the name of the LORD JESUS, through him, in all things, to glorify HIS FATHER AND OUR FATHER, HIS GOD AND OUR GOD.*

Bristol, Jan. 4. 1820.

* See MATT. xii. 50; JOHN xv. 8—14; EPH. vi. 24: COL. i. 3, 12; ROM. xv. 5, 6; Eph. iii. 14—21; v. 20; Phil. iv. 6, 7; MATT. iv. 10; vi. 9, 10; JOHN iv. 23: MARK xii. 29—24: COL. iii. 17; 1 PET. iv. 11; PHIL. ii. 9—11; and JOHN xx. 17.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTERS.

CHAPTER I.

THE CONTROVERSY RESPECTING THE ATONEMENT NOT RELINQUISHED BY THE UNITARIANS.

FOUNDATION of Dr. Magee's notion that the Question of Atonement is no longer made the subject of investigation by the Unitarians, p. 1—4. Import of *Unitarian*, p. 6. The Unitarians not silenced by the *Discourses*, p. 7—9. Dr. Magee takes no notice of an able Critique on his work in the *Monthly Repository*, p. 10. Why the discussion should be continued, p. 11;—and Dr. M.'s work examined, p. 12.

CHAPTER II.

CAUSES WHICH HAVE OPERATED TO PRODUCE DELAY IN REPLYING TO DR. MAGEE'S DISCOURSES AND DISSERTATIONS.

Repeated additions to the *Discourses*, &c., p. 14. The British Critic's low abuse of Mr. Belsham, p. 16, *note*;—and estimate of Dr. Magee's work, *ibid*. Mr. Belsham not required to notice Dr. Magee's attacks upon him, p. 17. Obstacles preventing others from answering it, p. 18—20. The British Critic's accurate prediction, p. 19, *note*;—and erroneous theory of the Author of this volume, *ibid*. General estimate of Dr. Magee's work, p. 20. Views of the Author in undertaking a Reply, p. 21.

EXAMINATION OF DR. MAGEE'S STATEMENTS.**CHAPTER III.****GENERAL VIEW OF UNITARIAN DOCTRINE: WHAT IT IS,
AND WHAT IT IS NOT.**

Fundamental Principles of Unitarianism, p. 22. Reference to works presenting the Scriptural Evidence for them, p. 24, *note*. Notice of Gifford's Elucidation, *ibid*. Influence of the evidence for those principles, p. 25. The Author's conviction in the truth and importance of the Proper Humanity of Christ, p. 26. If this, however, were incapable of proof, the fundamental doctrines of Unitarianism would remain unshaken, p. 27. Unitarianism not answerable for the political or metaphysical speculations of its adherents, p. 28—33. Christianity should not be supported by the arm of Civil power, p. 29, *note*. Tribute to the memory of Sir Samuel Romilly, p. 31, *note*. Extract from Mr. Gifford, p. 38. Unitarianism not answerable for the views of its advocates respecting the existence of a devil, p. 34;—or demoniacal possessions, p. 35;—or the inspiration of the Scriptures, p. 35;—or divine influences, p. 36;—or the state immediately succeeding death, p. 37. Christian excellence of the Rev. Newcome Cappe, p. 38, *note*. Importance of Unitarianism in reference to the doctrine of a Righteous Retribution, p. 39. The Author's views of the Seceders from the Establishment, p. 39, *note*. Unitarians universally reject the doctrine of Eternal Irremediable Misery, p. 40. Some hold the doctrine of Destruction, p. 42. Most hold that of Final Restoration, p. 43. The Evidence of Unitarianism not dependent on its advocates, but its influence materially so, p. 46.

CHAPTER IV.**DR. MAGEE'S CHARGES, OF GENERAL APPLICATION,
AGAINST UNITARIANS, AND ESPECIALLY
AGAINST UNITARIAN AUTHORS.**

Avowed object of Dr. Magee, p. 47. His wide scope of attack, *ibid*. Tendency of his work to prevent all religious inquiry, p. 48.

SECT. I.—*On the Alleged Ignorance of the Unitarians.*

Ex cathedra declaration of Dr. Magee, p. 50. Dean Graves repeats and exaggerates one of his strange and unfounded charges, p. 50—54, *note*. Course which Dr. Magee ought to have pursued in his attack on Unitarianism, p. 54. Anecdote connected with the “learned” Mr. Pierce, p. 55, *note*. In what respects *learning* is sometimes required in the controversy, p. 56. How far the Unitarians are inferior to their more privileged brethren, p. 56. Most important requisites for the successful examination of the Scriptures, p. 57. Course of Biblical Study in the Academical Institution at York, p. 58, *note*;—reference to the Classical Course, p. 60, *note*. Intellectual culture and religious inquiry strenuously encouraged among Unitarians, p. 61.

SECT. II.—*Respecting Christian Belief.*

Injurious effect of denying the title of *Christian* to the Unitarian, p. 62. In what case this would be just, *ibid*. St. Paul never speaks of the GOD-MAN, p. 63, *note*. Who have a right to the appellation *Christian*, p. 63—65. Force of the Apostolic Confession, p. 64. Course required by candour and the love of truth united, p. 65. Bishop Taylor's sentiments respecting HERESY, p. 65, *note*. Influence of some obnoxious expressions of Unitarian advocates, p. 67. Usual system of attacking Unitarianism, p. 68. Unitarian views of the Divine Authority of Christ, *ibid*. Very unjust to represent the Unitarians as *endeavouring* to degrade Christ, p. 69, *note*. Efforts of Dr. Magee to excite groundless feelings of wild alarm among his Orthodox brethren, p. 70—73;—paralleled by Prebendary Dennis's declamation about a “conspiracy,” p. 70, *note*. Effect of Dr. Magee's efforts, p. 73:—his avowed motto, p. 74. Various motives of our opponents, *ibid*. The author's first intelligence of Dr. Magee's elevation to the mitred chair, p. 75, *note*;—he thinks it dearly purchased, *ibid*.

SECT. III.—*On Reverence for the Scriptures.*

Bp. Magee's abusive representations, p. 76, 77. Extract from a Sermon by Dr. Toulmin, p. 77, *note*. The Author's estimate of the value of the Scriptures, p. 78. Unitarians generally relinquish the hypothesis of *plenary inspiration*, p. 79. What *inspiration*

is, p. 80. The Author's views of the inspiration of the O. T., *ibid*;—of the N. T., p. 81. General conclusion respecting apostolical authority, and the Scriptures at large, p. 82. On what this cheering conviction depends, p. 83. The Unitarian not guilty of irreverence towards the Word of God, p. 83, 84. To what reverence for it imperatively urges him, p. 84. Quotation from Bp. Marsh, p. 85, *note*. Statement of the case between the Unitarian and his accuser, p. 85—91. Various sources of the censures passed upon us, p. 86—89, *note*. "False and scandalous" charge brought against a "Socinian Teacher," p. 88, *note*. On the *Canon* of the N. T., p. 90, *note*.

SECT. IV.—*Authority of Individuals among Unitarians. The Bishop of Raphoe's Ignorance of the State of Unitarianism.*

Cause of the Bishop's miscalculation, p. 92. Doubts as to the extent of his faith, p. 92, *note*. Causes of reverence for the established system, p. 93. The case among Unitarians altogether different, *ibid*. Usually difficult to leave Orthodoxy, p. 94. On what the unlearned Unitarian mainly depends, p. 95—97. Criticism on Deut. vi. 4, p. 95, *note*;—strange rendering by Orthodox Critics, p. 96, *note*. Advantage of the diversity of opinion among Unitarians, p. 97. Authority of Dr. Priestley, p. 98;—of Mr. Lindsey, p. 99;—of Mr. Belsham, *ibid*. Why the Unitarian cites the "Worthies" who embraced his fundamental principles, p. 100—105. On the "obliquities" of WATTS, p. 101, *note*;—of WHITBY, p. 326, *note*;—of CHILLINGWORTH, p. 101, *note*;—of NEWTON, p. 102, *note*;—of LOCKE, p. 103, *note*. Erroneous notion of Bp. Magee on the subject, p. 105. The Bishop qualifies his indiscriminate charges, but leaves them unaltered, p. 106. Specimens of them, p. 107. His system of attack, p. 107;—why peculiarly disingenuous, p. 108. Curious specimen of argumentation, in which the assumptions and the inferences are alike gratuitous, p. 109—112. Editor of the *Monthly Repository*, p. 110. Bp. Magee fancies the Unitarian community to be a consolidated and organized body, p. 112.

CHAPTER V.

ON DR. MAGEE'S STATEMENTS RESPECTING THE
AUTHOR OF THIS WORK.

Dr. Magee's unlimited and indiscriminate censures of Unitarian Writers, p. 113, and p. 114, *note*. Limitation in his *Postscript*, p. 114;—which, however, does not essentially benefit the Author, p. 116. According to Dr. Magee, Dr. Carpenter stands in Bp. Burgess's *pillory* with Mr. Belsham, p. 117. Intolerant zeal and false alarm lead Bp. Burgess hastily to say the thing that is not, p. 117, *note*. Bp. Burgess an excellent *Επισκοπος* but a vanquished controversialist, p. 118, *note*. Two *canons* laid down by Dr. Magee, p. 118;—necessary restriction upon the second, p. 120, *note*. He charges Mr. Belsham with "gross falsification," p. 119, *note*. [N. B. The grounds of this charge are considered in *App. B.*] Some facts on the other side of the question, *ibid*. Position to be proved respecting Dr. Magee's citations, p. 120. Some minor specimens of unfairness, respecting the Author, p. 120. Dr. Magee's charge, in reference to Schleusner, affecting the Author's *credibility*, but shown to be utterly groundless, p. 120—125. Dr. Magee's work a complete chaos, p. 121, *note*. The genuineness of St. Luke's Introduction in no way affects the Author's belief in the doctrine of Simple Humanity, p. 123, *note*;—why he doubts the common interpretation of it, p. 124, *note*. Consideration of the Author's citation of Schleusner on 1 Pet. iii. 19, p. 126, *note*. The remaining instance considered in which the Author is said to be *pilloried* by Bp. Burgess, p. 127, *note*. Why, probably, Dr. Magee considers the Author as disbelieving in a *local* heaven, p. 128. The Author thinks himself deserving credit, notwithstanding the representations of Dr. Magee and Bp. Burgess, p. 129. Refutation of a charge often repeated against the Author, respecting his citation of Bishop Bull, p. 129—131, *note*. The Author pledges himself never to make any quotation in this work upon the authority of another, without express acknowledgment, p. 131.

CHAPTER VI.

ON DR. MAGEE'S MISREPRESENTATIONS OF
DR. PRIESTLEY.

The Author's own views of Dr. Priestley, p. 132—137. Dr. P.'s error respecting the Syriac Version, p. 134, *note*;—his familiarity with the Hebrew Scriptures, *ibid.* Dr. Magee's opinion as to the preparation of the mind for Unitarianism, p. 136, *note*.

SECT. I.—*Dr. MAGEE's Misrepresentations of Dr. PRIESTLEY, in the Dissertation on Human Sacrifices.*

Avowed object of Bp. M.'s attack on Dr. P., p. 138. Unjustly selects for that purpose Dr. P.'s papers in the *Theological Repository*, p. 138. Object of that work, p. 139, *note*. The Author for some time himself misled by the Bishop's assertions, p. 140. Dr. P.'s use of the term *Atonement*, p. 140. Bp. M. represents Dr. P. as denying the prevalence of human sacrifices, p. 141. Opinions really opposed by Dr. P., p. 142. Quotation from Bp. M., and exposure of its misrepresentations, p. 143—146. Bp. M. declares Dr. P. "gravely asserts" what he does not assert, p. 146. Wild language by which the Bishop practises on the feelings of his followers, p. 147;—refuted by a quotation from Dr. P. in the *Theol. Rep.* respecting the "salvation by Jesus Christ," p. 147—150.

SECT. II.—*System attacked by Dr. PRIESTLEY in the Theological Repository, as the "Commonly Received Doctrine of Atonement."*

Bp. M.'s accusation against Dr. P., of exaggerating the "principle of Atonement," p. 151. The Bishop's own views very far from Orthodox, p. 152. How far his charge is just, *ibid.*;—on what account fundamentally unjust, p. 153. Bp. M. charges Dr. P. with ARTIFICE, p. 153;—his unjustifiable mode of supporting the charge, *ibid.* Brief review of Dr. P.'s Essay signed *Clemens*, showing what system he really attacks, p. 154—158. Injustice of Bp. M.'s attack upon Dr. P., p. 159. Strictures on the Bishop's misrepresentations in his Third Dissertation, p. 160—165. Another instance of his system of suppression, p. 165—169. Important

passage quoted from Dr. P., showing the basis of his opinion, p. 169;—perfectly accordant with the analogies of religion, and the simplest principles of philosophy, p. 171.

SECT. III.—On Dr. PRIESTLEY's Representation of the Sentiments of the Jewish Writers respecting the Doctrine of Atonement.

Strange want of precision in the Bishop's use of terms, p. 172—174. He "fabricates" words for Dr. Priestley, p. 174;—and is guilty of "gross" breaches of controversial equity, p. 175. Misrepresents Dr. P.'s reasoning, and thereby makes it great nonsense, p. 177. Usual feelings of the Author, on examining Dr. Magee's representations, p. 178. Reference to Mr. Channing's (of America) excellent Discourse, p. 178, *note*. The Bishop obtains an easy victory over Dr. P., p. 179, 180. Dr. P.'s citation of Philo, unaffected by the Bishop's extracts, p. 181. Philo's writings favourable to piety, p. 182. His import of the term *Logos*, *ibid*. Weight of his evidence, p. 183, *note*, and p. 184. Examination of a specimen of Bp. Magee's "method of managing the testimonies furnished" by Philo, p. 184—187. Effect of these misrepresentations, p. 187. In what light they would be regarded if they came from a Unitarian, p. 188. The Bishop's conclusion respecting the evidence of Philo and Josephus, p. 188. The Author's remarks upon it, p. 188—190.

Dr. P. in the *Theol. Rep.* dwells too exclusively on the milder forms of heathenism, p. 190;—but as well acquainted as the Bishop, with the bloody character of heathen worship, p. 190, *note*.

SECT. IV.—On Bishop MAGEE's Charges against Dr. PRIESTLEY, concerning Reverence for the Scriptures.

What has given the Bishop some advantage over Dr. Priestley, p. 193. Most unjustifiable misrepresentation of an obnoxious expression, p. 194—196. Consideration of the expression itself, p. 196—198. Corresponding expression of Dr. Kennicott, p. 199, *note*. In what case Dr. P.'s reasoning would be correct, p. 200;—illustration, *note*. Better system pointed out by Dr. P. himself, p. 201. Admitting every thing against Dr. P., the Bishop is guilty of "gross falsification," p. 201. His system in part followed by

Dr. J. Pye Smith, p. 201, *note*. 'The equitable controversialist advised not to trust to Bp. Magee, p. 202.

Bp. Magee professes to *quote* from Dr. P.'s *Letters to Mr. Burn*, but the Author cannot discover the passage, p. 202;—what he has discovered, p. 203. Characteristic extracts from the *Letters*, *note*. What the Author used to believe respecting Bp. M.'s citations, p. 204;—and what now, *ibid*. Dr. P. retracts one obnoxious expression, p. 205. Testimonial to his merit by Dr. Price, *note*. A mitre dearly purchased, if only to be obtained by the system of attack on Dr. Priestley pursued by Dr. Magee, p. 206.

The Bishop represents Dr. P. as "laboriously employed" to deprive Christianity of some of its main supports, p. 207. Probable opinion as to the apostolical applications of prophecy, p. 208, *note*. Mr. Belsham's opinion respecting our Lord's application of prophecy, *ibid*. By what Dr. P. appears to have been influenced in his views, p. 209, *note*. Principle which ought to influence in the communication of opinion, p. 210, *note*. For whom Dr. P. appears to have considered himself as writing, *ibid*. Distinction seldom observed by the opponents of Unitarianism, p. 211.

Some of the worst features of Bp. Magee's controversial system, p. 211. His insinuations respecting Dr. P.'s *humility*, *piety*, and *uprightness*, p. 212—214, *note*. Bp. Magee declares, however, that he believes both Mr. Belsham and Dr. Priestley "to be INCAPABLE of DUPLICITY," p. 213, *note*. The Bishop's mode of proving that Dr. Priestley is guilty of "evading the authority of Scripture," p. 213—219.

Course to be pursued in reference to the difficulties and *apparent* inconsistencies in the Scriptures, p. 219—221. Luther's declaration on the subject, p. 220, *note*.

Extreme to which the opponents of Unitarianism run, p. 221. Revelation could not be intended to involve men in mystery and contradiction, p. 222. On what we are to found our faith, p. 223. State of the case respecting Dr. Priestley, p. 223—225. Probable effect of an intelligent inquirer's perusal of his works, p. 225. Notice of his *Discourses*, p. 226;—extracts from them, p. 227, 8;—from his *Letter to Mr. Venn*, p. 228;—from his *Disc. relating to the Evidences of Divine Revelation*, p. 229—231. His posthumous *Discourses*, p. 231.—His habitual perusal of the Scrip-

tures to the last, p. 232 ;—and his peaceful end, p. 233. Messrs. Bogue and Bennett's " wicked misrepresentation " of this, *note*. Rev. Wm. Turner's explanation of an expression which has been misunderstood, p. 234, *note*. Extract from Dr. P.'s Letters inserted in Mr. Belsham's *Life of Lindsey*, *ibid*. Original Letter from Dr. P. to Dr. Estlin, *App. E*. Mr. Corrie's delineation of Dr. Priestley's chaaracter, p. 236—238.

CHAPTER VII.

CONSIDERATION OF SOME OF DR. MAGEE'S REPRESENTATIONS OF MR. BELSHAM'S VIEWS AND ARGUMENTS.

Spirit of the Bishop's attack upon Mr. Belsham, p. 239. Character of his Appendix, *ibid*. Apologetic passage near close of it, p. 240. Effect of Mr. B.'s Reply to the *Exposure*, p. 242. Specimens of the Bishop's abusive language, p. 243, 4, *note*. The Author's appreciation of Mr. Belsham's writings, p. 244, 5. Reference to the Bishop's attack on Mr. B.'s *Elements*, p. 246, *note*.

SECT. I.—On Bishop MAGEE's Representations of Mr. BELSHAM's Religious System in Reference to PRAYER.

Dr. M. asserts, and repeats the assertion in every edition of his work, that Mr. B. " rejects the notion of PRAYER," p. 247. Notice of Dr. Percival's *Father's Instructions*, *note*. Some facts respecting the Essex-Street Liturgy, *ibid*. The Bishop's assertion shown to be false, p. 247—253. Bp. M. guilty of unjustifiable suppression, p. 250. Objections of the Author to Mr. B.'s *Review*, *ibid*. A noble passage from an Ordination Charge by Mr. Belsham, p. 251. Selections from his Forms of Infant Baptism, p. 252, 3.

Great diversity in the expression of the affections generally, p. 253 ;—and in the devout affections, p. 254, 5. General character of the Liturgy of the Church of England, *note*. Mr. W. Fox's view of it, p. 255, *note*. Tests of genuine devotedness of heart to God, 255. Mr. B. does not separate the divine and social virtues, p. 256. Devotional influence of Unitarianism, p. 256, 7.

SECT. II.—On the Religious Observance of the Lord's Day.

Character of the Bishop's attack on this subject, p. 258. What Mr. B. really says, p. 258—260. The Author objects to some expressions, p. 260. Vast importance of Public Worship, p. 260. Requisites for its due influence, p. 261. Mode of spending the Lord's Day, *ibid.* Liberal system of the Gospel, p. 262. Quotation from Mr. B.'s Review, *note*;—Dr. M.'s mode of citing it, *ibid.* Benevolent policy requires the frequent stated cessation from the usual labours of life, p. 262. What Christian duty requires, respecting its amusements and intercourses, p. 263. To what conclusion these principles lead, p. 263, 4. Beneficial influence of Public Worship, p. 264. Mr. B.'s statements on this subject, though objectionable to many Unitarians, in no way justify Bp. Magee's exaggerated representations and criminal insinuations, *ibid.* What these are, p. 265, 6. The Author's views respecting one of Mr. B.'s statements, p. 266—268. Quotation from Mr. Grahame's Sabbath, p. 266, *note*. Fresh proofs that no reliance is to be placed on Bp. M.'s *quotations* and *assertions* respecting the advocates for Unitarianism, 268. How far the Author agrees with Mr. Belsham, p. 269. Tribute of respect to Mr. Wilberforce, *note*. That Senator's attention solicited to a point of great moment to the moral welfare of our country, *ibid.* Extract from the Rev. John Simpson on the Sabbath, p. 270. [N. B. There is some account of Mr. Simpson in *App. D.*]

SECT. III.—On the Inspiration and Character of our Lord.

The Author objects to an unqualified statement of Mr. B. on this subject, p. 271. What he regards as the opinion of Unitarians, p. 271, 2. Another connected statement to which the Author objects, and why, p. 272—274. The declaration of divine mercy and of the terms of acceptance an express object of the work and death of Christ, p. 272, *note*. Exaggerated and unjustifiable *interpretation* by Bp. Magee, p. 274. Extract from the *Calm Inquiry*, and Bp. Magee's mode of quoting it, p. 275. Examination of some calumnious *insinuations* of the Bishop, respecting Mr. B.'s views of our Lord's moral character, p. 276—279.

SECT. IV.—On the Doctrine of the FINAL RESTORATION of the Wicked to Purity, and consequently to Happiness.

Bp. Magee thinks fit to represent Mr. Belsham as holding the doctrine of PURGATORY, p. 280. Mr. B.'s real opinion, p. 280, 1. Some arguments on the subject, p. 281—283. Bp. M. indulges himself in sarcastic levity upon it—is he prepared to maintain the tremendous alternative, p. 283, 4. The Bishop represents the doctrine of Final Restoration as taught in the Koran, p. 284, *note*. Boston's statements founded on the popular doctrine, p. 285, *note*. Bishop Newton held that of Final Restoration, *ibid*. Reference to Hartley on the subject, *ibid*. The Author's expectation as to the future estimation of Bp. Magee and Mr. Belsham, p. 285, 6. His own full and unwavering conviction as to final success of Unitarianism, p. 286—288.

CHAPTER VIII.

ON BISHOP MAGEE'S STATEMENTS RESPECTING THE IMPROVED VERSION.

The Bishop attacks Mr. Belsham through the Improved Version, p. 289. Extensive sale of this work, *ibid*.

SECT. I.—General Statements respecting the TEXT and the BASIS of the IMPROVED VERSION, and the Responsibility of the Principal Editor.

Text followed by the I. V., p. 290. Extracts from the Eclectic Review, and from Bishop Marsh, on the value of Griesbach's Text, p. 290—292, *note*. Basis of the Translation, p. 292—295. The Author's objections to Newcome's rendering of *μακαριος* in Matt. v. 1—11, &c., p. 293, *note*,—and remarks on his rendering of *Κυριος*, *ibid*. Dr. Nares charges Archbp. Newcome, through the I. V., with SYSTEMATIC EVASION, p. 294, *note*. Remarks on Newcome's rendering of *χαρις*, p. 294.

To whom the peculiar merits and defects of the I. V. are principally to be referred, p. 295. How far the Unitarians as a body are answerable for it, p. 295, 6. Unprincipled representation of Mr.

Rennel, p. 296, *note*. Blunder of the "Student," p. 297. Mr. R. strangely stigmatizes the venerable Primate, in order to bear down the Editors of the I. V., p. 297, 8, *note*. Responsibility of the principal Editor, p. 297. The Author's opinion of his share of the work, p. 298, 9. No "chronological difficulty" in St. Luke's Introduction taken independently of that to St. Matthew's Gospel, p. 299, *note*. The Author's judgment of Bp. M.'s *Postscript*, p. 301. One main reason for his examining it, *ibid*.

SECT. II.—ARCHBISHOP NEWCOME'S REVISION *really the Basis of the IMPROVED VERSION.*

Consideration of the charge founded on the omission of the word Unitarian in the title-page of the I. V., p. 302—304. Bp. M. and Mr. B. both wrong. p. 303, *note*. Fact illustrating the indisposition of the Orthodox to read what the Unitarian publishes, *ibid*. Summary reply to Bp. Magee's insinuations on another charge, p. 305. Shocking imputations made by the Bishop, p. 305—307, *note*. In what case the Author will feel respect for him, p. 307, *note*. Introduction proving that the I. V. really has Newcome's Revision as its basis, p. 306—308. Claim of the Author to credit on this subject, p. 309. Bp. M.'s chief weapons against the I. V., and how obtained, p. 308—310. The Unitarian Reviewer's judgment respecting them, p. 310.

SECT. III. *Of the Specific Cases in which the IMPROVED VERSION leaves ARCHBISHOP NEWCOME'S REVISION without due acknowledgment.*

Rash and unfounded assertion of Bishop M. on this subject, p. 311, 12. Why the Author examines his "Specimens," p. 313. The Bishop's bill of indictment against the I. V., 313, 14.

I. LUKE i. 35, p. 314—316. The Bishop commits an error while condemning that of the I. V., p. 315.

II. JOHN i. 12, p. 316—318. Remarkable way in which the Bishop supports his insinuation that the Editors had sinister objects in view, p. 317. Bitter and abusive charges founded on Mr. Belsham's criticism on John x. 18, p. 318. [N. B. These are considered at large in *App. B.*]

III. JOHN iii. 13, p. 318—321. Bp. M.'s chief object in noticing this passage, p. 320. The Author's intention when he reprints *Unitarianism* &c, p. 321. Who are Unitarians, *ibid*.

IV. ROM. ix. 5., p. 322—329. The Bishop here guilty of extreme injustice towards the Editors, p. 322, 3. Wakefield's Inquiry cited, p. 324, *note*. Objections against the conjecture of Slichtingius, *ibid*. The Bishop condescends to make an insinuation against Mr. B.'s learning, on an obvious error of the press, *ibid*. The British Critic speaks of the "acknowledged accuracy" of the Bishop, p. 325, *note*. Mr. B.'s statement respecting Dr. Clarke defended in the main point, *ibid*. Bp. Magee leaves the Unitarian rendering of Rom. ix. 5, unaffected, p. 323—326. The Unitarians right in preferring it to the Orthodox rendering, p. 327. Bishop M.'s course respecting Whitby, p. 326, *note*. Whitby's "Last Thoughts," *ibid*. Noble passages from the Preface, p. 327, 8, *note*. The Bp. of St. David's insinuations respecting Whiston, Whitby, and Bishop Law, p. 328, *note*.

V. 2 COR. viii. 9, p. 329—333. Bp. Magee's egregious misrepresentations of Mr. B. on this text, p. 330, 1 ;—and on *Phil. ii. 6—8*. p. 322, 3. Difference between the pages of the two Authors, *ibid. note*.

VI. HEBR. xiii. 25, 26, p. 334—337. The Bishop's system continued on this text, p. 334, 5. He talks about the Editors *fabricating* the word "*God*", p. 335, 6. [N. B. In *App. C.*, the Reader will find some remarks on the Bp.'s use of the Unitarian Reviewer ; and in *App. D.*, an examination of his strictures respecting 1 Cor. x. 9.]

The Author sums up Bp. Magee's evidence against the Improved Version, p. 337, 8 ;—and maintains that, notwithstanding Bp. Magee's assertions, he has done his worst, p. 338, 9. The Bishop's concluding invective, p. 339. The Author's concluding judgment on the Bishop, p. 340.

Reference to the Rev. W. Turner's "Two Discourses," in connexion with the following Chapter, p. 341.

CONCLUSION.

CHAPTER IX.

ON THE BENEFICIAL TENDENCY OF UNITARIANISM.

Argument against Unitarianism from its supposed effects, p. 343. Those who urge it do not argue justly, 342—344. No inferences to be drawn from the conduct of the merely speculative Unitarian, p. 344, 5. The argument from the conduct of persons to the truth of their opinions a difficult one to manage successfully, p. 345. *A priori* arguments which satisfy the Unitarian of the beneficial tendency of Unitarian doctrine, p. 345, 6. Direct arguments, p. 346—372.

I. *Unitarianism encourages the sound exercise of the UNDERSTANDING in matters of Religion*, p. 346—351.

The well cultivated intellect must value a doctrine in proportion to its freedom from obscurity, p. 347. Unitarianism easy to be understood, p. 348 ;—removes the main difficulties which have prejudiced thinking men against the Gospel, p. 348, 9 ;—and peculiarly adapted to the intelligent poor, p. 350.

II. *Unitarian Christianity presents ONE Object of Religious Worship and of the highest Affections of the heart*, p. 351—354.

Notice of a recent publication maintaining the “Sole, Supreme, and Exclusive Divinity” of our Lord, p. 351, *note*. Perplexities on this important point, arising from popular systems, often have led to Unitarianism, p. 351—353. Common doctrines divert the highest affections from their right channel, p. 353. Many practically Unitarians, though in belief Trinitarians, p. 353, 4. On this point Unitarianism is unrivalled, p. 354.

III. *Unitarianism throws no impediment in the way of the great PRACTICAL PRINCIPLES of the Gospel*, p. 355—359.

Unitarianism ascribes no *merit* to works, but lays the utmost stress upon *good works*. p. 355 ;—yet assigns its due place to *faith*, p. 355 ;—and cuts off fallacious expectations at their source, p. 356. Direct tendency of the present popular doctrines, p. 356. Dr. Doddridge’s excellent view of the fundamental principle of

religion, p. 357. Unitarian views of Christian duty, eminently safe and secure, p. 357, 8.

IV. *Unitarianism throws no impediment in the way of CHRISTIAN LIBERALITY AND AFFECTION*, p. 359—365.

Unitarianism leaves the way to divine acceptance open to all, p. 359. Why it is peculiarly worthy of all acceptance, p. 360. The worst influences of the doctrine of exclusive salvation manifested in the nearer connections of life, p. 361, 2. Illustrative fact stated by Dr. Cogan, p. 362. Dr. Cogan's Theological Disquisitions recommended, p. 363, *note*. Extracts from a Memoir of this Christian Philosopher, *ibid*. Notice of Mr. B. Goodier, p. 364, *note*. What stimulates the Unitarian in his exertions, p. 364. Influence of Unitarianism on the benevolent affections, p. 364.

V. *Unitarianism shines forth resplendently in respect to the CHARACTER and DISPENSATIONS of the great FATHER of all*, p. 365—372.

Gloomy views of the Divine Dispensations arising from popular doctrines, p. 365, 6;—not from Christianity, p. 367. Unitarianism peculiarly cherishes reverence and love to God, p. 367—369. Notice of Dr. Pye Smith's recent assertion on this subject, p. 368, *note*. The high Orthodox doctrines inconsistent with the paternal character of God, p. 369;—but Unitarianism completely accords with and is founded upon it, p. 370. Unitarianism is certainly not deficient in the sources of piety, p. 371, 2.

PROSPECT OF ITS UNIVERSAL DIFFUSION, p. 372—378.

The Unitarian has many fellow-labourers, and his doctrines must spread among Christians before Christianity is extensively diffused, p. 372, 3. Prophecy points to their universal diffusion, p. 374. What the Unitarian has to do under discouragements, *ibid*;—and how he is to disseminate his principles, p. 375. Beneficial effect of the bitter spirit which exists against Unitarians, *ibid*. Already extensive spread of Unitarianism, p. 376, 7. Course and encouragement of the Unitarian, p. 377, 8.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX A.—*Specification of the Unnoticed Departures of the IMPROVED VERSION from the Text of NEWCOME'S REVISION*, p. 379—382.

APPENDIX B.—*On BISHOP MAGEE'S Strictures respecting the Unitarian Interpretation of JOHN x. 18.*

The original of this passage, the rendering and note of the I.V., and Wakefield's note, p. 383, 4. MS. notes in a copy of the I. V., by an Orthodox Minister, p. 384, *note*. Reasons for the rendering of the I. V., p. 385, 6. Consideration of the force of John ii. 19., p. 385, *note*. Hypothesis of Bp. M. to reconcile the general tenor and numerous express declarations of Scripture with the supposed meaning of two passages, p. 386, *note*. Stanhope's hypothesis respecting the agency of the Son in his miraculous conception and resurrection, p. 387, *note*. Doctrine of the Scriptures, p. 388, *note*. Reference made to an expression of the Rev. E. Butcher, *ibid*. Bp. M.'s mode of overturning the rendering of the I. V., p. 387—389. *Εξουσία* may be justly rendered by different words in the same sentence, p. 389. The Bishop undertakes to prove against Wakefield what he never denied, p. 390;—and then rashly asserts that “*Trommius, Biel, and Schleusner*” assign to *ἐξουσία* “the sense of *power* generally, in its fullest and strongest import,” &c. *ibid*. This assertion shown to be groundless, p. 391, 2; (see also p. 398). The Bishop charges Wakefield with *smuggling*, p. 393;—and is himself guilty of unwarrantable suppression of evidence, *ibid*;—even while he is charging Mr. Belsham with “falsifying” authorities, p. 394. The Bishop's charge examined, p. 394—396. From Mr. B. he extends it to Unitarian Writers generally, p. 396, 7. Mr. B. too little attentive in this instance, to the (here unimportant) minutiae of citation, p. 397;—but Bp. Magee the last person to make it the ground of so shocking an imputation, p. 397, 8.

APPENDIX C.—*On the use made by BISHOP MAGEE of the Unitarian Reviewer's Statements respecting the Variations of the IMPROVED VERSION from GRIESBACH's Text ; and on the system adopted with regard to the Greek Text by recent Critics.*

Bp. Magee quotes from Dr. Nares an erroneous statement respecting the Unitarian Reviewer, p. 399 ;—the Reviewer's own view on the subject, *ibid.* The Bishop reiterates the declaration, p. 400 ;—which is shown to be unfounded, *ibid.* Not above four instances of doctrinal importance in which the I. V. leaves Griesbach's Text, p. 401. On whom the charge often made against the Unitarians really rests, p. 401. Retrograde course of Dr. Hales, p. 402. Dr. Pye Smith not likely to follow him, p. 403.

Estimation in which Griesbach's Text was recently held by Critics of the Established Church, p. 404. English Editions, p. 405. In what case he is now neglected, *ibid.* Notice of Dr. DAKINS's Edition of the Greek Testament, p. 405. The DUNCANS' Edition, p. 406. This latter appears to be a reprint from AITTON's, p. 407. Shameless system pursued by Aitton, p. 408 ;—which is lamentably followed by the Rev. E. VALPY, p. 408—410. Specimen of the cases in which Mr. Valpy follows Griesbach, p. 410—412. What several of them prove, p. 412. Specimen of Mr. Valpy's departures from Griesbach, p. 413—417. Aitton's text much nearer to Griesbach's than Valpy's is, p. 413, *note.* How, probably, the Duncans might make their beautiful edition truly Griesbachian, *ibid.* Principle which every Editor of the Greek Testament should lay down, *ibid.* Mr. Valpy's reason for retaining the "gross interpolation" in 1 John v. 7, 8, p. 415. Notice of Griesbach's *Diatribē* on this passage, p. 416. General inference from the foregoing induction, and censure on Mr. Valpy's text, p. 417. Duodecimo edition printed from it, p. 418. Recommendation to the BISHOP OF RAPHOE on the subject of "UNITARIAN PRACTICES," p. 418.

APPENDIX D.—*Consideration of BISHOP MAGEE's Remarks on the UNITARIAN Interpretations, &c., of 1 COR. x. 9.*

Griesbach's judgment as to the *reading* of the passage, p. 419. Notice of the LEIPSIĆ edition of 1805-6, p. 420, *note.* Rendering

and interpretation of the passage, in Newcome's Revision and the Improved Version, p. 420. Macknight's condemnation of the interpretation adopted by Bp. Magee, p. 421. Statements of the latter, p. 421—426. Defence of Griesbach's 8th Canon, p. 422. Griesbach's statement of the evidence for *Xριστον, Κυριον, and Θεον*, p. 423, *note*. Strange assertions of the Bishop, p. 424. His system the direct opposite to that of Archbp. Newcome, p. 425. The common reading of the passage decides nothing against Unitarianism, p. 426. Bishop Magee's censure on Mr. Simpson's interpretation, p. 427. Character of Mr. Simpson by a Clergyman, p. 428, *note*;—of his View of the Evidences of Christianity, *ibid*. Other extracts from Mr. J. Hunter's Tribute to his Memory, *ibid*. Bp. Magee's inference from the Author's citation of Mr. Simpson, p. 429. His wild misrepresentation on a more important point, p. 430. His charge against the Unitarians rests with tenfold pressure on many Trinitarians, p. 431.

APPENDIX E.—Original Letter from Dr. PRIESTLEY to Dr. ESTLIN; and Mr. JERVIS's Notice of the late Mr. BRETLAND.

Dr. Priestley's Letter to Dr. Estlin, from America, in 1797, p. 432—434. Dr. Estlin's serene and happy end, p. 434. Extract from the Sermons of Mr. Bretland, showing his appreciation of the Scriptures, p. 435. Character of that Christian Divine, by the Rev. T. Jervis, p. 436. Dr. Toulmin's views in reference to his own dissolution, p. 437.

EXAMINATION

OF THE

CHARGES,

&c.

Errata.

The Reader is particularly requested to correct the following errors, (some of which are not typographical,) as several of them affect the sense.*

- P. *6, l. 8. *dele* 'very.'
- 39, l. 4 (*of Note*), in *the Absolute Unity*.
44. l. 2 (*of Note*), for 'VIII.' read VII.
- 49, l. 1, for 'bright,' read glowing.
- *74, l. 18, for 'politics,' read policy.
- *100, l. 21, for 'he is,' read they are.
- 119, l. 16, for 'Chapter VII.' read Appendix B.
153. l. 5 (*from bottom*), and other misrepresentations.
- *171, l. 11 (*from bottom*), *dele* 'to.'
- 236, l. 2, *dele* 'Priestley's.'
- 248, l. 8, p. 341 [805].
- *266, l. 7 (*from bottom*), civil right, whether.
- 305, l. 4 (*from bottom*), to the Editors "the grossest.

EXAMINATION

OF

DR. MAGEE'S STATEMENTS RESPECTING UNITARIANS
AND UNITARIANISM.

CHAPTER I.

THE CONTROVERSY NOT RELINQUISHED BY THE
UNITARIANS.

"THE question of Atonement is no longer made the
"subject of investigation by the modern Socinians :
"and now, after a lapse of fifteen years from the
"first publication of this work, it is openly (and, it
"may be said, officially,) announced, that the pro-
"secution of the controversy upon this doctrine is
"to be relinquished." *

* *Postscript to the Appendix of the Dean of Cork's Discourses and Dissertations on the Scriptural Doctrines of Atonement and Sacrifice, 1816, p. 366 [830]. This Postscript forms part of the second volume of Dr. Magee's 4th edition; and it is paged accordingly: but it was also very properly published separately, for the purchasers of the former editions; and in this form it is paged afresh, which causes some inconvenience for reference. To remedy this and the difference in the other volumes, I shall not only give the page of the copy I employ, (the 3d edition, 1812, with the Postscript as an additional volume,) but subjoin, as above, in crotchets, the page as found in the fourth edition; and this I hope will prevent all mistakes.*

2 EXAMINATION OF DR. MAGEE'S STATEMENTS.

This singular assertion is founded on the following statements of Mr. Belsham:—

“ If the proper humanity of Christ be once
“ established, the commonly received doctrine of
“ Atonement falls to the ground. And being fixed
“ in the belief of this great truth, that there is one
“ God, the Father only, and one Mediator between
“ God and man, the **MAN** Christ Jesus, I have not
“ thought it necessary to make any direct reply to
“ the elaborate, and, in his lordship's estimation,
“ *triumphant* work of Dr. Magee; nor to enter
“ upon the profound inquiry, whether the Deity was
“ displeased with Cain because he envied and hated
“ his brother, as St. John tells us, 1 Ep. iii. 12, or
“ because he offered a vegetable and not an animal
“ sacrifice, as Dr. Magee supposes. (See Magee on
“ Atonement, p. 49.) As the Unitarians do not
“ believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, it cannot be
“ incumbent on them to prove that the second person
“ in the Trinity did not die upon the cross to appease
“ the anger, or to satisfy the justice, of the first
“ person in the Trinity.” *

The allusion, made by this powerful advocate of Unitarianism to Dr. Magee's curious Dissertation respecting the sacrifice of Cain, receives, of course, a *gentle* rebuke from his very reverend antagonist; the merits of which might be examined, if there were

* *Belsham's Discourse* (1814) on the Progress of Intellectual, Moral, and Religious Improvement; with an Appendix, containing a *Summary Review* of a publication of the Lord Bishop of St. David's, entitled, “ A Brief Memorial on the Repeal of the 9 & 10 of William III. &c.” p. 137.

not much more important work before me: but I beg the Reader's attention to the foregoing position of the Dissertator, founded, as it is, solely on the premises which I have just cited.

Mr. Belsham's opinion is, undoubtedly, that when the doctrine of our Lord's proper humanity is established, the *commonly received doctrine of Atonement* falls to the ground; and that he who receives the former, is under no obligation to disprove the latter. It will soon appear that I do not agree with Mr. Belsham on this point: but what are the conclusions derived from it by this logical disputant? Mr. Belsham, *one* "modern Socinian," entertains the opinion here stated respecting the *commonly received doctrine of Atonement: therefore*, the question of Atonement (of course taken *generally*) is no longer made the subject of investigation by the modern Socinians *at large*. And again; Mr. Belsham declares that he does not think it incumbent on those who do not believe the doctrine of the Trinity to disprove a position founded on that doctrine, or incumbent on himself, as a believer in the simple humanity of Christ, to reply to Dr. Magee's triumphant work; *therefore*, the prosecution of this controversy is to be relinquished.

Of such sophisms, Dr. Magee's massy work furnishes numerous specimens. Some of these I shall have occasion to notice: and, in the course of this volume, I expect to make it evident that, abundantly as the learned writer has employed the poisoned arrows of that species of polemical dispute, in which victory is to be secured at any rate, he does not manifest that

solid discriminating judgment and that pure love of truth and justice which, united, would have preserved him from the misrepresentation of his opponents' arguments, and enabled him to appreciate their real force and importance.

Dr. Magee's supposition, that the Unitarians had relinquished the prosecution of this controversy, appears, however, to have been in part produced by a singular train of reasoning which is found in the Postscript, p. 355 [819]. He had informed his readers, near the beginning of his Postscript, p. 73 [537], that "the Editors of the Unitarian Journal" had, in their number for December 1814, "notified their intention of making the doctrine of the Atonement the subject of their special examination, in a series of ensuing publications," and "for this purpose invited the free communications of the several correspondents." In this last passage he tells them that a Letter of Mr. Frend's on the subject of Atonement, drawing "a broad line of distinction between himself and such Unitarians as Mr. Belsham," "*there is good reason to think*, had the effect of deterring the conductors of that journal from carrying forward the discussion on that subject." Mr. Aspland, the sole Editor of the Monthly Repository, and Mr. Frend, could tell him that his inference was erroneous; and any reader of that journal might show him that it was unfounded. But I go further, and say that it is a proof of the most culpable negligence, in one who was bringing such heavy and numerous charges against his brethren, if he did not *know* that it was unfounded. Dr. Magee has shown us that

he was well acquainted with the volume for 1815,* in which it was earnestly hoped by many that the doctrine of Atonement would have received a full discussion: he therefore ought to have known the two following facts. (1) Mr. Frend's Letter (inserted in the first number for the year 1815) *did not* deter the Editor from carrying forwards the promised discussion; for he introduced communications on the subject even to the very last number of the volume.† And (2) Mr. Frend himself, having, by vague expressions, drawn what Dr. Magee calls a "broad line of distinction," maintained a persevering silence as to the import of them, though repeatedly called upon to define precisely the difference existing between himself and the Unitarians to whom he referred.‡

It is, however, the fact, that Mr. Frend's letter

* See *Postscript*, p. 352 [816], where there is an enumeration of above twenty pages (from p. 226 to p. 745), as references to papers respecting the use of the appellation *Unitarian*.

† In this number are several of the papers referred to in the preceding note, and included in the Dean's enumeration; and there can therefore be no doubt that he was not ignorant of its contents. What must we say, then, when we perceive that the first paper under the head of Miscellaneous Communications, is an able Letter *expressly* ON THE ATONEMENT, and that the Writer (G. of Manchester) adverts to the "*hardy assertions and inimitable criticisms of Dr. Magee*"? See *Monthly Repository* for 1815, p. 738.

‡ With a specific view to my own inquiries, I also solicited Mr. Frend to state his views in the *Monthly Repository*, but without effect; and I do not find that he has ever given his Unitarian brethren any clue to his meaning. That view of the ends of the Death of Christ which, possibly, he adopts, I shall have occasion to notice hereafter.

contributed to lead away from the subject of the Atonement. He made some statements respecting the more extended use of the appellation *Unitarian*, which brought about a discussion displaying too much of that polemical and even party spirit which the defence of truth does not require, and which the Christian's rule forbids.* The result has nevertheless been beneficial. With a very few exceptions, the term *Unitarian* is now applied, among us, to all who hold the Absolute Unity and Unrivalled Supremacy of God, even the Father, who regard Him as the Sole Object of Religious Worship, and view Him as the Sole Original Source of the blessings which we possess through Christ Jesus. In compliance with what, at the period when I wrote my Letters to Mr. Veys, was among all parties the prevalent use of the appellation, I employed it in its more restricted sense, implying a belief in the Proper Humanity of Christ. Since that time, I have gladly contributed to extend the application of the term, believing that the principles, which separate all who avow them from the fellowship, and even the worship, of every Trinitarian Church, ought to be the bond of union among the themselves; and knowing that among the believers in the

* I must, in this connection, refer my younger Unitarian brethren to an invaluable Discourse, entitled *the Love of Truth, Branch of the Duty of Benevolence*, by J. Kenrick, M. A., published by R. Hunter, St. Paul's Church-yard. If the opponents of Unitarianism would read it, it might afford them also some useful lessons.

Proper Humanity of Christ, differences exist on points much more important than the Pre-existence.*

The controversy in the *Monthly Repository*, to which the Dean of Cork paid so much attention, could not have prevented his observing, not only that some original papers appeared there on the doctrine of Atonement, but also that a tract had recently been published by one who was educated for the Calvinistic ministry, in reply to a Sermon, &c. on the Sacrifice of Christ, by his theological tutor; I refer to Mr. Fox's able and eloquent Letters to the Rev. John Pye Smith, D. D. Perhaps the Dean might think that he was not bound to read a Unitarian treatise on the subject, if not particularly directed to himself; but there was one passage in the *Review* of it, in the *Repository*, which might have shown him that he had been libelling the Unitarians, and which common candour should have led him to quote for the information of his readers. It does not completely express what I deem the full import of scriptural declarations on the subject; but it cannot be read by the candid of our opponents, without their perceiving that Unitarianism is not without the genial warmth of real Christianity.†

* I refer to the state between death and the resurrection, and especially to the final condition of the wicked. On these topics, Unitarians, as well as other classes of their Fellow-Christians, are divided among themselves.

† See *Monthly Repository* for August 1815, p. 518. It may be acceptable to the reader to have before him the passage I refer to. It is as follows:—

“ Unitarians consider the death of Christ as an important part

It must appear to those who derive their views of Unitarianism from the representations of Dr. Magee, that since his work was first published, in 1801, the Unitarians have been silent on the subject; and many believe, with the *British Critic*,* “that the controversy “on the Atonement is laid at rest, beyond the chance “of further agitation.” The real state of the case is different. In 1805, my highly valued friend, Mr. Wright, published a tract entitled the *Anti-Satisfactionist*, which, in an improved form, he republished in 1811, under the title of the *Free Grace of God*. Of the existence of this small but comprehensive treatise the Dean of Cork must have been aware, from a volume of my own, to which he himself repeatedly refers, viz. *Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel*:

of the divine plan for the redemption of mankind from sin and misery. It was necessary that the Messiah should suffer. (Luke xxiv. 46.) His death perfected his lovely example; sealed the truth of the gracious doctrines which he taught; and was essential to his resurrection and exaltation, on which rest our hopes of immortality and bliss. Hence its tendency to purify the depraved, and console the wretched. Hence we believe, equally with you, that he gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity; that his blood cleanseth from all sin; that by his stripes we are healed; that he hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God; and we unite with you, in ascribing unto him that loved us, and has washed us from our sins in his own blood, and made us kings and priests unto God and his Father, glory and dominion for ever! (Titus ii. 14. 1 John i. 7. 1 Pet. ii. 24., iii. 18. Rev. i. 5, 6.) Such passages are beautiful descriptions of the moral influences of his death; and it is our desire to partake of the holy feelings which they so finely express.”—*Fox's Letters on the Sacrifice of Christ*, p. 11.

* See *Brit. Crit.* for Sept. 1816, p. 301.

Perhaps some of Mr. Wright's reasonings might have convinced him that he had not been infallible in his positions ; at any rate, an acquaintance with his work might have saved him from some striking proofs of ignorance respecting the controversy in general, and some wild misrepresentations of the Unitarians in particular.

In the interval between these editions of Mr. Wright's work was published my reply to Mr. Veysie (1809) ; and in 1811 this was republished, with considerable alterations in form and some additions, under the above-mentioned title. One large portion of the volume respects the Scripture Doctrine of Redemption ; and though, for reasons which will hereafter sufficiently appear, no specific notice was taken of the Discourses and Dissertations, yet the Author presumed that the views which it presents of the Agency of Christ in the Gospel-scheme of salvation, and the explanations it contains of the Scriptural expressions supposed to favour the popular opinions, might satisfy the intelligent inquirer, even if he had entered the mazes in which the Dean involves the subject.

But what is more than all, (to pass by some single sermons, the existence of which the Dean might have learnt from the Monthly Repository,* and the valuable tract on the Sacrifice of Christ, above noticed,) the volume for 1814 contained, in four numbers, a judicious and able Review of the Discourses and

* For instance, a truly evangelical and excellent Discourse by Mr. Madge, on the *Salvation of Man by the Free Grace of God*; and another, by James Yates, M. A. entitled *The Nature, Manner, and Extent, of Gospel Salvation*.

10 EXAMINATION OF DR. MAGEE'S STATEMENTS.

Dissertations. The brief but comprehensive and acute strictures which are found there, certainly demanded the Dean's attention, and claimed some notice in his subsequent edition: yet he still leaves unaltered in the fourth, p. 412, the remark which appears near the close of the third, p. 492. "It is now ten years" [more than twelve years] since the first publication of this work; and, during that time, neither Mr. Belsham, nor any of his learned Unitarian fellow-labourers, have, as far as I know, favoured the public with any observations upon the arguments which it contains." Dr. Magee was, however, acquainted with the number of the *Monthly Repository* for December 1814; and twelve pages of that number were occupied with the conclusion of a criticism on his work, from a pen which is guided by sound learning without ostentatious display.*

But to return to Mr. Belsham's statements. I entirely disagree with my respected friend as to the present state of the controversy on the Atonement, and the course to be pursued by the advocate for the proper humanity. No one, who maintains this doctrine, can hold any form of the Atonement that represents the death of Christ as *appeasing the anger*, or

* "His *Appendix* (says the judicious Reviewer, *Monthly Repository* for 1814, p. 785) is highly discreditable to his reputation, both as a scholar and a gentleman; and must class among the most censurable effusions of arrogance and unfairness in controversy." The Critic had not the task of reviewing the Dean of Cork's *Postscript*, or he must have used still stronger expressions of censure.

Of this Review we must suppose the learned Dignitary ignorant: and yet, is it possible?

satisfying the justice of God ; or even any that simply represents it as necessary to enable God to extend his mercy to the sinner ; and for his own convictions it may be needless to enter upon the discussion. Yet, to promote the great interests of Gospel truth, even these unscriptural doctrines must be examined, and held up in their just light : for the mind clings to them more than to mere abstract notions respecting the Trinity ; and often is prevented from perceiving the fundamental truth, the Divine Unity, by the bewildering mists in which the doctrine of Satisfaction involves it.

But the case is more important, as it regards the Unitarian's own belief, with respect to the moderate views of the ends of the death of Christ. Some of these, which nevertheless do not appear to me to be true, may be held consistently with the great principles of Unitarianism, and even in connection with the doctrine of simple humanity : and I am greatly mistaken if there is not much perplexity in the minds of many Unitarians as to the real efficacy of the death of Christ. Anxious to keep close to Scriptural guidance, and believing that the views of some, with whom on most points they agree, will not account for the expressions of the New Testament on the subject, yet deriving from the opinions of their opponents, once their own, impressions which prevent the import of various passages from being perceived, they do not see precisely where the truth is placed : and while they steer clear of all theories which imply that Christ is the cause and not the effect of God's love and mercy, they are solicitous, for their own sake, and for the spread of divine truth among others, to

ascertain the real meaning of the authorised teachers of Christianity.

Now it is a remarkable fact, that in Dr. Magee's notions of the Atonement, *as far as they are intelligible and self-consistent*, there is nothing which the Unitarian may not embrace,—nothing absolutely inconsistent with the great principle, that all the blessings of the Gospel, and all the means by which they were assured and communicated, originated in the Free Unpurchased Essential Mercy of God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Hence there has long existed an earnest and extensive wish, that Dr. Magee's work should be examined ; and that the real ends of the death of Christ should, if possible, be ascertained, and the expressions concerning it in the Scriptures clearly and fairly explained.

But besides this, the triumphant language of the opponents of Unitarians, and the appeals which are continually made to the Discourses and Dissertations as decisive and unanswerable, call for some reply. Four editions of the work have been printed : and though “ more praised than read,” yet the offensive calumnies with which it abounds are easily, and have been extensively, diffused ; and as they have not been refuted, they are supposed by multitudes to be true. The widely extending Evangelical party cannot view the Dean of Cork's sentiments on the Atonement as correct, any more than the Calvinistic Dissenters ; but both of these classes, as well as the Orthodox and the Secular Clergy of the Church of England, can derive from this armoury an abundant supply of hostile weapons ; and, without the trouble of reading

the Unitarians' books, can at once denounce them, from the pulpit and the press, as perversers of the Gospel, as God-denying apostates, as systematically evading the truth, as under the name of Christians the decided enemies of Christianity, and deliberate falsifiers of the Gospel, &c. &c. &c.*

In justice therefore to ourselves, we desire to give our opponents an opportunity of perceiving that they widely err respecting us : and, if they will not hear the other side, we must then be satisfied with living down the prejudices against us, and taking care, by our lives, and by our writings, to avoid mixing with those grand principles, which it is our privilege to possess and our honour to advocate, any thing which can check their diffusion or diminish their value.

* The characteristics of the *Evangelical* party in the Establishment are well known. Those, who for some years were spoken of as the *True Church*, are now (it is understood) termed *Orthodox*, and are distinguished by their firm attachment to the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England, *as such*, (without reference to Calvinism or Arminianism,) and their indisposition to unite with those whom they term sectaries in religious objects of common interest. By the epithet *Secular*, I wish to denote that class, who are not solicitous about articles of faith and modes of worship on account of their supposed truth and value, but who are attached to the Church of England as the religion of the State, and supported by its honours and emoluments; and who believe that all worldly respectability is contained within its precincts. For the interest of religion one would willingly hope, that few deserve an exclusive place in this division ; but is not the secular spirit distinctly visible among many who class under the other divisions ? That religious establishments naturally foster such a spirit is one grand evil inseparably connected with them.

CHAPTER II.

CAUSES WHICH HAVE OPERATED TO PRODUCE DELAY IN REPLYING TO DR. MAGEE'S DISCOURSES AND DISSERTATIONS.

IN the foregoing chapter, some reasons have been assigned, which show it to be at least expedient to prosecute the controversy on the Atonement, with a particular reference to the Dean of Cork's Discourses and Dissertations. I shall here state a few considerations relative to the more general causes, which have operated to prevent a regular formal answer to that work.*

The progressive additions to it have been one cause of the delay. The original work consisted of one volume only. I have never met with more than one copy of it; and that I have not seen since about three years after the publication of it: but I distinctly remember that it had the characters of an ill-digested production, containing nothing new in the main controversy, and deficient even in the common principles of composition. It seems, however, to have early gained, among the Orthodox public, more attention than could antecedently have been expected; and by whatever means it obtained the popularity which it gradually acquired, that popularity gave it a degree of consequence, which its intrinsic merits did not

* For those for which the Author of this volume is in some measure answerable, the Reader is referred to the Preface.

possess. In the course of three or four years, the work was completely out of print; and in 1807 the public were informed by the booksellers, that a new edition was in the press. The publication of this second edition, which was doubled in size, did not, however, take place till the end of 1809; and, through the highly raised expectations of its importance to the cause of Orthodoxy, it was sold so soon that another was begun early in 1810. This third edition was announced almost before the Unitarian could read through the second; and whatever disposition might have existed to notice this assuming work, common prudence required that it should be left till the Author had given it his last improvements. In 1812, the new edition appeared, with large additions, but without any essential improvement in point of argument, and with a still wider departure from the laws of legitimate controversy. The assertions of the Author began to be regarded as established truths, because they were not contradicted; his work was represented as triumphant and unanswerable; his representations of Unitarian principles and modes of interpretation were disseminated through various channels; and thousands, probably, who never read his work themselves, were well acquainted, second-hand, with his railing words and virulent declamations.*

* If any of my readers are unacquainted with the Discourses and Dissertations, they will think my censures excessively harsh, and perhaps unfounded. I entreat them to suspend their judgment on this point, till they have seen my *proofs*, which will hereafter appear in sufficient abundance. They can scarcely peruse half a dozen pages of the Dean's Postscript without perceiving them.

Though Dr. Magee's arguments affected none of the great principles of our common Unitarianism, and his representations of their advocates were so generally without foundation that we believed they could be entertained by none whose minds were open to our refutation, yet many who saw the impression produced by them against us and our cause, thought it very desirable, that the nature and fallacy of his charges against us should be plainly exposed ; and

In what light the productions of this learned Dignitary are regarded by those of his own extensive class in the Establishment may be perceived from the critique on the Postscript, in the British Critic for September 1816,—a critique marked by servile adulation to the Author, and acrimonious hostility towards the Unitarian Writer who is most the object of the Dean of Cork's stigmata. I shall have occasion to refer to some of its statements hereafter; and, in return, I am prepared for my share of that low abuse of Unitarians, which has so often appeared in the British Critic, and to which, I should hope, the anonymous Author would be ashamed to put his name. Would he, for instance, if possessed of gentlemanly, to say nothing of Christian, feelings, like to avow the following passage? “ That unnatural induration of froth and
“ fæces, which, in the Unitarian head-piece, supplies the place of
“ brains, is laid open by the dissector's knife.”

The British Critic's opinion of the work under examination may be seen from the first paragraph of the article referred to. “ In introducing the present volume [the Postscript] to the
“ acquaintance of our readers, we are rather called upon to describe
“ its contents than to detail its perfections. The fifteen years,
“ which have elapsed since the publication of *Dean Magee's great*
“ *Work*, have placed THE DISCOURSES ON ATONEMENT AND SACRI-
“ FICE in the rank of books of *standard authority*, and have
“ enrolled the author among the most celebrated names in English
“ Theology. To announce the publication of a supplementary
“ volume to that work is to pronounce its *sufficient panegyric*.”

that for our own sakes the ends of the death of Christ should be discussed somewhat at large.

The individual who was most injured, and the power of whose pen is well known, declined, however, to notice the imputations which had been thrown on his talents and character. Mr. Belsham believed that “it would not be a difficult task to show the fallacy of the arguments which are alleged by this learned writer, in favour of what he calls the Atonement of Christ; nor to point out his misinterpretation of the sacred Scripture:”* but it was scarcely possible to separate Dr. Magee’s discussion, (if so it may be termed,) from the opprobrious and insulting personalities with which he continually attacks him; and from the pen of Mr. Belsham, more; perhaps, was not required, than the notice which he has taken of them in the Preface to the third edition of his *Review of Mr. Wilberforce’s Practical View*, published in 1813.†

* *Belsham’s Review*, third edition, Pref. p. viii.

† This is also the opinion, I perceive, of the Reviewer of *Magee on Atonement*, in the *Monthly Repository*, December 1814, p. 785. “In every part of this Appendix, not excepting even the mottoes, Mr. Belsham is treated with a superciliousness and vulgar illiberality, which forbid him to bestow any great share of his time and thoughts upon such an antagonist. By quoting detached and garbled passages from his works, by imputing to him principles which he does not hold, and charging upon him consequences against which he has guarded his statements and reasonings, the Dean of Cork flatters himself that he has obtained an easy triumph.” Since the publication of Dr. Magee’s *Postscript*, I have felt satisfied that he had no claim upon Mr. Belsham’s notice of any of his charges against himself.

When it was found that the Unitarian advocate, to whom friends and foes had naturally looked for a reply to the Discourses and Dissertations, declined the undertaking, many considerations operated to prevent others from engaging in it. No one could do it, without the risk of having his peculiar views, and his errors if he committed any, attributed to the Unitarians in general. Each had occupation enough in his respective department. There are among the Unitarians no sinecures ; and it rarely happens that we derive sufficient emolument from our labours in the ministry, to enable us to provide for our families, without uniting with our pastoral duties the education of youth, or some other employment occupying our time and thoughts. Few of us have access to such theological libraries as would supply us with the voluminous works we want for reference. And still further, the discussion is carried on by the learned Dissertator with such extreme vagueness and encumbering diffuseness, that it requires, not severe study, for to that we would readily submit, but quiet leisure and freedom from other engagements, to follow him through his various mazes, and to form, if possible, a regular plan to suit the chaotic mass before us.

Nor are these the only obstacles. Who could willingly engage in controversy with an author who, imitating the example of a more acute and powerful disputant, and, as may reasonably be supposed, with similar expectancies,* endeavours to bear down the

* The *British Critic* (as above referred to,) who writes as one who knows the state of the Dean's feelings and prospects, (" we

doctrines of an unpopular sect, and the arguments of those who defend them, by vilifying the talents and the character of his opponents? It is a savage species of warfare that is to be opposed. And if the author of a reply to the Dean of Cork do not succeed in convincing him, that he has offended against the laws of Christian equity and candour,—that he has been guilty of glaring perversion of our views,

speak not," says he, "*from conjecture,*") authorizes this opinion. "The perilous situation of that Church of which he is so zealous and powerful a defender, must, ere long, call him to discharge the duties of a more elevated but laborious station; and, in whatever situation he is placed, he must be an effective labourer. It is idle, indeed, to talk of the *claims* of any person to preferment, where the *right* of patronage is acknowledged. But we rely too implicitly on the good sense and discernment of those who hold the distribution of those honours in their hands, to doubt that they will long suffer themselves to be reproached by the eminent services of the individual before us."

It is now the middle of 1819, and I do not find that "those who hold the distribution of those honours" have proved their title to the Reviewer's implicit reliance. Perhaps their "good sense and discernment" may have led them to perceive, that, in proportion as Dr. Magee advances in the dignities of the Establishment, he more and more forgets the characters of true dignity by which he should adorn his elevation; and that, for the credit of the Church, they should pay some attention to the directions of the Apostle Paul respecting the essential qualities of a Bishop, (Titus i. 7—9.) *Δει γὰρ τὸν ἐπισκοπὸν ἀνεγκλήτῳ εἶναι,—μὴ αὐδαδῆ, μὴ ὀργίλον,—μὴ ἑλαττήν*: of which we may take Schleusner's interpretations, and maintain that a Bishop should not be one, *qui sibi nimis placet et plaudit, suos tantum sensus et consilia sua sequitur, et reliquos omnes ALTO SUPERCILIO contemnit; insolens, arrogans, et jactabundus: ad iram præceps, et ad ulciscendum proclivis: qui alios CONTUMELIOSE tractat, et verbis in eos invehitur.*

injurious misrepresentations of our arguments, and illiberal aspersion of our motives,—and in dispelling the mists with which the learned Dignitary appears enveloped, which prevent him, to take the most favourable supposition, from understanding that which he condemns, and which cause him to combat, instead of realities, the monsters of his own creation,—he can expect nothing but a repetition of “false and slanderous imputations” directed against himself, certainly not to the advantage of his peace or of his good name.

There is nothing in the character of Dr. Magee's work, to make the examination of it interesting. There is scarcely an oasis to afford rest and refreshment to the wearied mind, while traversing the desert. Those who, in perusing the writings of the Dean of Cork, merely look for the indications of scholarship and extensive reading, for caustic ardour and controversial dexterity, for confidence in his own critical and theological decisions, for supercilious and abusive invectives against those whom he attacks, and for the most extravagant assumption of superiority to them, will be satisfied: but if any seek for the luminous arrangement and close reasoning of the sound logician, for the accurate cautious inferences of the mathematician, for the discriminating penetration and enlarged comprehension of mind which should be learnt in the schools of literature and philosophy, or for that well-proportioned union of independence of understanding and humility of soul, that correctness and impartiality in the statement of evidence, and that openness to conviction, and ability

to discern what is just and important in the midst of apparent error, which form some of the striking characteristics of him who pursues truth, fearlessly yet judiciously, for the love of it,—they may, under the influence of that charity which hopeth all things, hope that the intellectual and moral character of the Divine is not to be decided by his writings; but, in their search for such qualities as I have enumerated, they must be disappointed.

Personal controversy can be desired by no liberal mind. It has no tendency to cherish the Christian spirit; and for myself I may be permitted to say, that nothing but the hope of promoting the great cause, whose importance I estimate in proportion as I study the foundation of it, and consider its connections and consequences, would have led me to undertake a work in which personal controversy must have so large a share. Severity of language I must in this Part frequently employ; but I hope that nothing will escape me under the influence of resentment, or which my judgment must hereafter condemn. I wish carefully to avoid that injustice, of which, in behalf of my Unitarian brethren and the cause we support, I complain, and which I must show in its real colours; and I pledge myself to spare no pains to render my statements accurate. It is my earnest desire to keep close to the great condition of an upright witness, "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." As far as I know it, by the blessing of God, I will.

CHAPTER III.

GENERAL VIEW OF UNITARIAN DOCTRINE. WHAT
UNITARIANISM IS AND WHAT IT IS NOT.

UPON the express, unambiguous, and frequently repeated declarations of Scripture, the Unitarians universally believe, not only that there is **ONE** but that **GOD** is **ONE**; that **JEHOVAH**, the Creator of heaven and earth and all things therein, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is **ONE**, in substance indivisible, in being underived and independent, in power unequalled, in glory unrivalled, supremely good and infinitely wise, all-holy, all-just, and all-gracious; ‘the blessed and only Potentate,’ ‘the King eternal, immortal, and invisible,’—in short, ‘**THE ONLY GOD.**’ This all-perfect Being, the Father of mercies and of all consolation, whose essential character is *Love*, they believe, upon the same authority, to be the **SOLE** original source of every good and perfect gift; His grace and mercy, the spring of all the inestimable blessings we derive from the Gospel; His unerring wisdom, and constant agency, the cause of all good means by which the gracious scheme of salvation through Christ was executed and permanently diffused. They refer all to God, as the Scripture do; and say ‘Of Him, and through Him, and by Him, are all things.’ This great and gracious E

Jehovah, the Father, they believe, upon the authoritative declarations of those who were divinely inspired,—of Moses and the Prophets, of Christ and his Apostles,—to be the **ONLY** proper object of religious worship, the Being to whom **ALONE** are due the supreme gratitude and adoration of the heart and of the life : and while they pay to their revered Lord the tribute of grateful love, of admiring veneration, and of submissive reverence, they believe that they **HONOUR** him more, by praying to the Father in his name, (owning his authority, agreeably to his commands, and under the influence of his principles and spirit,) than by offering him that worship* which he never claimed, and which, they doubt not, would have been rejected with horror, by one who was himself the devout worshipper and faithful obedient servant of the Most High.†

It is not the design of this work to display the scriptural evidence for these great fundamental truths;‡ but it appeared expedient to state them

* I need scarcely say, that I do not refer to that *worship* or *homage* which was rendered our Lord during his ministry on earth ; but to that which, in the strict sense, is *religious worship* ; that which our Saviour doubtless meant, when he said, ‘ Jehovah thy God thou shalt worship, and Him **ALONE** shalt thou serve : ’
Κυριον τον Θεον σου προσκυνησεις, και αυτω μονω λατρευσεις.
Matt. iv. 10.

† See Mark i. 35 ; Luke vi. 12 ; Matt. xxvi. 36 ; Heb. v. 7, &c. &c. Matt. xii. 18 ; Heb. iii. 2. v. 8 ; John iv. 34, &c.

‡ For this object I refer the Reader, with great confidence, to the following works : Hopton Haynes's *Scripture Account of the Attributes and Worship of God, and of the Character and Offices*

24 EXAMINATION OF DR. MAGEE'S STATEMENTS.

here, that the essence of the controversy between the Unitarian and Trinitarian may be distinctly understood. Even if the evidence were inadequate, which convinces a very large proportion of the Unitarians,

of *Jesus Christ*; Gifford's *Elucidation of the Unity of God*; and Yates's *Vindication of Unitarianism*, in Reply to Mr. Wardlaw's *Discourses on the Unitarian Controversy*. The last two works are peculiarly valuable in this connection, as they solely take into consideration those essential principles of Unitarianism, by which, and by which alone, Unitarianism must stand or fall.

The name of Gifford is now well known among us, in connection with the able and interesting tract, *The Remonstrance of a Unitarian, addressed to the Bishop of St. David's*, by Captain James Gifford, R. N. *The Elucidation of the Unity of God* was written by Captain Gifford's Father. I doubt whether it is as much known, among the younger Unitarians at least, as it deserves: I never saw it myself till the spring of 1816. It must have had an extensive circulation, for the edition of 1815, now lying before me, is the *fifth*. Subjoined to it is a *Letter from the Author to his Grace John Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*, third edition. The Letter is dated January 27, 1785. The conscientious earnestness of the Writer, unmixed with acrimony and sarcasm; the uniform indications of a solicitous love of truth, and of a serious solemn conviction; his constant and successful appeals 'to the Law and to the Testimony;' his acute, perspicuous, and discriminating examination of prevalent opinions opposing what he deems Scriptural Truth, and the truly evangelical, pious, and catholic spirit which displays itself throughout, give it a standard value, and make it deserving of the attentive and repeated perusal of all who desire to know the real merits of the Unitarian controversy. They will see that Unitarianism is not a matter of barren speculation; but that it consists of, or cherishes, such views of religion as

"Inspire the heart with filial love,
"Exalt and fix our hopes above."

The *Elucidation* further manifests a respectful attachment to the

that he, 'whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world,' and whom he declared to be his 'beloved Son,'—to whom he gave the spirit without measure, and whom he raised to exalted glory and power,—was simply, as to nature, a human being, 'in all things' 'like unto his brethren,'—yet still, as long as the firm foundation of the above truths remains unshaken, (and, in my full conviction, unshaken it must remain, till the Scriptures are proved to be 'a cunningly devised fable,') the doctrines held (in words at least) by the great bulk of professed Christians, respecting the person of their Lord, must be unfounded. And though the Unitarian may not always be able to satisfy his mind, as to the real import of expressions in the Scriptures that are supposed to countenance the opinions which he opposes, yet, with the effulgence of evidence for the Absolute Unity, the Unrivalled Supremacy, the Exclusive Worship, and the Free Essential Mercy of God even the Father, as his guide,—and with the confident belief that Revelation cannot contradict

Church of England, which renders it peculiarly suitable to be put into the hands of any inquiring intelligent member of the Establishment; and I know no work which, for this purpose, I can recommend with so much satisfaction.

It may not be deemed improper to mention, with the above references, two little tracts by the Author of the present volume; one entitled *Proof from Scripture that God even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is the Only True God, and the Only Proper Object of Religious Worship*, containing Remarks on the Rev. Dr. J. Pye Smith's Discourse on the Adoration of our Lord Jesus Christ; the other, *A Comparative View of the Scriptural Evidence for Unitarianism and Trinitarianism*.

itself,—his faith in those great principles remains unshaken; and the apparent difficulties attending them he feels no more oppressively, than those attending the usual dealings of Providence, which much more frequently call for the exercise of humble faith and trust. ‘God is Light, and in Him is no darkness at all;’ but the light in which he dwells is inaccessible, and its beamings are sometimes too bright for the mortal eye. There are rich and abundant displays of wisdom and of goodness; but difficulties in the works and ways of God must exist, to our limited comprehension, as long as trust and resignation form an essential part of human excellence. The Absolute Unity and Unrivalled Supremacy of Jehovah depend on evidence as *certain* as the truth that ‘the Lord is good to all, and His tender mercies are over all His works:’ and the difficulties attending it are only as the mote in the sun-beam.

Resting on the evidence afforded by the general tenor of the Gospel History, by various expressions in the New Testament, and by the reasonings of the Apostles,—evidence to my mind clear and decisive,—I stand unshaken in the conviction of the proper humanity of Christ Jesus.* In this conviction, I have clear and unembarrassing views of his labours and actions, his trials and temptations, his character and

* A summary view of this evidence may be found in *Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel*, second edition, p. 86—123, 265—269. I need scarcely refer, in this connection, to Mr. Belsham’s *Calm Inquiry into the Scripture Doctrine concerning the Person of Christ*, §. xii. entitled “Direct Arguments for the proper Humanity of Christ.”

motives, his sufferings and death : I discern the genuine influence of his example, and perceive the true force of his resurrection, as the pattern and pledge of our own. That he should be fixed upon as the Instructor, the Saviour, the Sovereign, and the Judge of Mankind, who was in all respects like his brethren, who was tempted in all points like as we are, who could be touched with a feeling of our infirmities, who was himself a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, who was made perfect through suffering, and who had only those supports under the weaknesses, the wants, and the distresses of humanity, which, through him, have been liberally supplied to all who seek them with full purpose of heart,—the supports arising from holy obedience, and filial love, and faith in the Great Being who sent him,—appears to me a striking display of the wisdom of the Only Wise God. It in no degree lessens my gratitude for the blessings which he brought from his God and Father, and the gracious purposes which, under his authority and guidance, he executed, that the *Mediator between God and Men* was the MAN *Christ Jesus*.

Nevertheless, I repeat it, if the reasonings in Dr. Magee's first Dissertation, and in his Postscript, were conclusive as to the passages which are usually supposed to teach the pre-existence of Christ, (though, like most others on the same side of the question, he pays no attention to the *direct proofs and arguments* in favour of the doctrine which he opposes,) still the fundamental truths of Unitarianism would remain unaffected : and if these are true, *Trinitarianism*, in every form, and under every explanation,

(except such as makes it *Unitarianism in disguise*, and involves it in all the inconsistencies of *Sabellianism*,) must be as much without solid foundation in the Scriptures, as it is contrary to the plain dictates of reason. Now the views which in this work I shall endeavour to unfold, respecting the ends of the death of Christ, are mainly independent of any doctrine as to his nature ; and, at any rate, they may, in their leading features, be held in perfect consistency with the belief that he existed, before his human birth, in a state of great glory and happiness. I think it quite unnecessary, therefore, to enter here into any examination of the arguments adduced by Dr. Magee in favour of our Lord's pre-existence.

I am not surprised that Unitarianism has been attacked through a doctrine held by most of its present defenders, and which some have represented, with perhaps too little discrimination, as an essential part of it. But, that it should be made answerable for the philosophical and political views of those who have professed it, or even for the peculiar religious doctrines which they have held, and perhaps advocated, in connection with it, could, *à priori*, have been expected only from the most illiterate as well as the most prejudiced among its opponents. Who would think of attacking Newton's theory of Gravitation, or Locke's doctrine respecting Innate Ideas, by opposing their errors, if such they were, on religious subjects ? Who would reject Hartley's grand principle of Association, because the philosopher believed that a time will come when all mankind will have been made holy and happy ? Who would endeavour to confute

Priestley's discoveries in Chemistry, by showing that Priestley was what is called a Socinian, a Necessarian, and a Materialist?

Unitarianism is answerable for no opinion which it does not teach, or to which it does not necessarily lead : it is answerable for no doctrine which can be held in perfect consistency with the errors which it opposes : it is answerable for no practices which it does not direct or sanction.

Among none are the great principles of civil and religious liberty better understood, or more cordially imbibed, or the rights of private judgment more consistently and fearlessly maintained, than among the Unitarians ; but even for these, Unitarianism is not answerable. They are not confined to those who hold it : I rejoice in the progress of them among many who earnestly and conscientiously oppose it. They are cherished by the liberal intellectual spirit of our common Christianity ; and Unitarianism presents no obstacles to them, and therefore encourages them.*

* I cannot resist the opportunity presented, of entering my earnest protest against all attempts to stop the progress of Deistical principles by the arm of civil power. It is really melancholy to think, that, at this enlightened period, the folly and absurdity, as well as iniquity, (for such I deem it,) of attempting to support the sacred cause of Christian truth, by inflicting fines and imprisonment on those who reject it, and endeavour to lead others to do so, are not clearly and practically perceived. Christianity needs not such defence ; and those who seek to support it by such means, will do vastly more injury to the faith of others, than could be produced by the *unaided* diffusion of the books which they endeavour to suppress. Millions saw the parodies of Hone,

30 EXAMINATION OF DR. MAGEE'S STATEMENTS.

There is a closer connection between the doctrines of Unitarianism, and the views which are now rapidly extending, respecting the ends of judicial punishment, and the limits to be affixed to it : but the advocate for the sanguinary spirit of our penal code would surely have no just pretext to attack Unitarianism, because the views which it supports of the paternal character of God commonly lead its adherents, by no circuitous train of reasoning, to maintain that his rational offspring, uniting in society, should carefully keep in sight, as the *ONLY justifiable ends of punishment, the prevention of crime and the reformation of the offender.**

who, but for the prosecutions against him, would have been free from their irreligious influence.

Attached most cordially, with full consent of heart and understanding, to the Gospel of Christ, and earnestly desiring to see all men sharing in its blessed privileges and sanctifying influences, I ask not for it the support of human law, or human courts of justice. In proportion to my value for it, is my regret that such means should be employed in its defence. Vastly better would it be to convince the unbeliever, by showing, with the mildness of Christian love, united with the earnestness of strong conviction, the 'reason of the hope that is in us;' and by taking care that our 'light so shine before men,' that they may 'glorify our Father who is in heaven.'

* This subject presents a striking proof of the vast importance of persevering individual exertion in a great cause, and of free but temperate discussion. Truth will prevail; and the public mind will eventually be led, by such exertions and discussions, to sound views on all practical subjects. Those which justice and benevolence support will be embraced in proportion as they are clearly and completely understood. Even events which throw a temporary despondency over the mind, as apparently

Some Unitarians are metaphysicians, and enter into the speculations which have agitated the world, respecting the homogeneity of the human being, the liberty of human actions, the source of moral obligation, &c.; and on these points they differ as

checking the progress of truth, are made by Him who bringeth good out of evil, to accelerate it. The death of that illustrious Patriot and Philanthropist, who laboured with such exemplary patience and perseverance, in the midst of bitter discouragement and galling disappointments, to ameliorate the penal code of England, gave an impulse to the feelings of the Public, and contributed to awaken their attention to that which had been the object of no small portion of his unwearied labours,—labours, to the extent of which must be greatly attributed that state of mind, over which religion had no power, through her principles or her consolations. Attached to ROMILLY only because he was so firmly and consistently attached to a cause which I hold sacred, the cause of civil and religious liberty, and because he so steadily laboured, with sound judgment and enlightened ardour, to promote its various directions, I observed, with heartfelt satisfaction, his unsullied career of public duty and of political integrity and benevolence. Personally unacquainted with him, and even by name probably unknown to him, I endeavoured to lead others to appreciate his merits,* that they might be more interested in the success of his great object; and I cannot forbear now to express the warm respect with which I regard his memory.

Humanity has cause to rejoice, that one has been found to enter into his labours, who, under brighter auspices, is pursuing the same great course, with still more commanding talents, and with an increased band of able coadjutors, both in and out of Parliament. To my mind it is peculiarly interesting to see among these the honoured name of ROSCOE. His recent work on *Penal Jurisprudence*, appeals powerfully to the best affections, as well as to the soundest dictates of the understanding; and it cannot appeal in vain.

* See *Systematic Education*, vol. ii. p. 374, 2d edition.

widely in their conclusions, as others of their fellow-Christians; but with those conclusions *Unitarianism* has no concern. The great bulk of its professors are but little acquainted with these speculations;* and their knowledge respecting them is confined to what they learn concerning the nature and expectations of man from those writings which contain wisdom from above, and which teach, in terms too plain to be commonly mistaken, the will of Him with whom we have to do, and his gracious purpose respecting us. And whether or not they know any thing of materialism and immaterialism, of liberty and necessity, &c. &c., I am sure they possess that knowledge which will make them wise unto salvation. Even speculations purely metaphysical have their value; and I cannot but most highly appreciate the importance of several departments of mental philosophy, to persons of inquiring and cultivated minds; but among Unitarians, as among other denominations, (though probably in a much less proportion among the former,)

* "Unitarians, as such," says Mr. Belsham, "differ from each other upon political, metaphysical, and all other topics of discussion, like other men. Some of them regard Mr. Pitt as a heaven-born minister; others believe Mr. Fox to have been the wisest and greatest of statesmen. The majority are as zealous for philosophical liberty, without very well knowing what it means, as if their salvation depended upon it; and are as ignorant and as violent as the multitude about what they suppose to be, or choose to call, *Materialism*, which, as they understand it, is a doctrine which no person in his senses would ever maintain."—*Review*, 3d edition, Preface, p. xv.

I think Mr. Belsham rather unmerciful towards his unphilosophical brethren; but the general fact cannot be doubted.

are multitudes who can know only the more essential practical principles which mental philosophy inculcates, and who would be unable to enter into the investigations on which they are founded. It is a source of grateful joy, that those practical principles will, in their essence, be known by all who faithfully devote their lives to the obedience of Christ, and walk in the Law of their God.

I could not allow some expressions in the last paragraph to remain unqualified; since they might seem to cast a slight on a branch of knowledge which I regard as the most important pursuit in which the reflecting mind can engage, next to the more immediate concerns of religion, to which it directs, and to which it is eminently subservient: but I proceed with my more immediate object. I am solicitous to separate, in the minds of those who have candour and discrimination, the opinions through which Unitarianism is made the object of groundless dread and abhorrence, from those great principles with which they are often unreasonably associated.

“Zealous to walk in a plain and well-enlightened path,” says Mr. Gifford, in his Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, p. 256, “the Unitarian Christian, in contradistinction to all the complex systems of human invention, maintains that the All-glorious God of the Universe is simply and absolutely ONE;* that there is no God (in the proper sense of the term,) WITH HIM,† nor LIKE HIM,‡ nor EQUAL TO HIM:§ and,

* Deut. vi. 4; Mark xii. 29; 1 Cor. viii. 4, 6, &c.

† Deut. xxxii. 39.

‡ Is. xlv. 9.

§ Is. xl. 25; xlv. 5.

34 EXAMINATION OF DR. MAGEE'S STATEMENTS.

consequently, that HE ALONE is the TRUE GOD ; that He ALONE is the Great Object of all Religious Adoration.* And it is further maintained, that it is altogether impossible that the Prophets and Apostles, speaking as they did by divine inspiration, would have asserted the Unity of God so clearly and positively as they have done, (and without the least *exception or reserve*,) unless it were *strictly* true, and *incapable of any dangerous or erroneous consequences whatsoever*, when *directly* adopted by mankind, as a principle most sacred and inviolable, as the basis, as the *sine quâ non* of true religion."

Why is this important principle to be assailed through the opinions which some have held with it, and on which those who hold it are greatly divided? Most, probably, who maintain it, deny the existence of a devil,—considered, at least, according to the popular notion, as a being possessed of little short of ubiquity and omnipotence, and the cause of our evil thoughts and dispositions ; but many would be found to have no distinct opinion on the subject, resting satisfied with the simple doctrine of the Apostle James, that ' every man is tempted, when he is drawn aside and ensnared by his own evil desires: '†

* Exod. xxxiv. 14 ; Matt. vi. 6, 9, &c.

† Here and elsewhere I shall take the liberty of leaving the Public Version, where the Original may be more correctly and perspicuously rendered. James i. 14, runs thus: ἕκαστος δε πειραζεται, ὑπο της ιδίας επιθυμίας ἐξελκομενος και δελεαζομενος.

I am glad to perceive that even contemporary dignitaries of the Established Church do not hesitate to reject the notion entertained by many, that the common translation is sacred, if not inspired ;

and, at any rate, it is a question which is only so far connected with Unitarianism, as this contributes to enlighten the mind concerning the character and dealings of our Heavenly Father.

The great bulk, probably, of those Unitarians who have entered on the question, believe the demoniacal possessions, spoken of in the New Testament, to be nothing more than the disorders now termed insanity, epilepsy, &c. ; but many, who adhere closely to the Divine Unity and its immediate consequences, have no opinion on the subject, or entertain an opposite one ; and the same and still greater diversity exists among other classes of Christians respecting it.

While all Unitarians believe that Moses, and the Prophets, and the Apostles, were inspired, according to the various purposes for which they were commissioned, and that the Scriptures contain a faithful record of divine

and that those, whom all sound Churchmen must admit to be right in such things, prove practically, that it is possible to depart from it without justly incurring the charge of Socinianism,—which is a generic term, as all know, to denote impiety, blasphemy, apostasy, heresy, pride, presumption, ignorance, perverseness, &c. &c. &c. I was led to this remark, by an expression of the Bishop of Meath, in his recent Discourse entitled *Faith without Works as dead as Works without Faith*,—a discourse which, though not without undue asperity, I imagine, towards his Evangelical brethren and inferiors, contains abundance of sound doctrine to which they will do well to listen, and some from which others of his brethren and inferiors might learn some useful lessons. I shall probably have occasion again to advert to this Discourse ; I now briefly notice the following passage (page 21,)—“ he expressly told the multitude, who hung upon his words, that he came not ‘ to destroy,’ or, as it might be more correctly translated, ‘ to dissolve the law, but to fulfil it.’ ”

Revelation, much diversity exists as to the *degree* in which inspiration was communicated to the Writers of the Old and New Testament. But for these speculations, which cause diversity also among intelligent thinking men of all denominations, why is Unitarianism to be made responsible? If I saw evidence to believe that the Spirit of God dictated every word which we find in the common copies of the Scriptures, it would not affect my own convictions, already founded on the explicit repeated declarations of Him in whom there is no variableness nor even the shadow of a change. I acknowledge the divine authority, not only of the proofs on which I rest my belief, but of the passages in the original Scriptures which are brought to oppose it: and the hypothesis of their universal plenary inspiration I regard as opposing Unitarianism no further than as it affects the broad basis of Christian faith.

Related to this subject, is another on which Unitarians are much divided. While all, probably, deny that there are, in the present day, those supernatural communications of divine truth to which some lay claim, and which may in the strictest sense be called *inspiration*,—and reject those views of religion and divine agency, which make men rest on frames and feelings as the test of their spiritual safety, rather than on their progress in the vital principle of godliness or religious obedience, in that holiness of heart and righteousness of life which it is the great object of the Gospel to promote,—while all, who unite with their speculative belief in Unitarianism the enlarged views of Christian duty to which it directly leads, and

with which it is usually found connected, must feel convinced, and rejoice in the conviction, that the Father of our spirits affords aid, support, and guidance, to those who seek his favour, as their greatest good, by the faithful though imperfect discharge of their duty,—yet the *manner* and *degree* in which he thus influences the heart, is a subject on which we are undoubtedly divided: it is a subject, of all others, perhaps, the most difficult to the religious inquirer; and on which few thinking persons, of any denomination, will be found to agree minutely. It is, however, of great practical importance that our views should approximate to the truth; and such will be the case, when the Christian quietly follows the great Directory of his duty, and aims, faithfully and humbly, to do his work, confiding that He who has given it him to do, will strengthen, succour, and direct him, if he see it needful, in that way which is wisest and best; that if he acknowledge God in all his ways, He will direct his steps; and that if he truly love Him, all things will work together for his good. Unitarianism lays the axe at the root of all the *abuses* of the doctrine of Divine Influences; but, with respect to the doctrine itself, it only teaches what Revelation teaches, be that what it will.

And the same may be said as to those opinions which respect the state immediately succeeding death, and the judgment to come. Some few of those who are united by accordance in the great principles of Unitarianism believe that the judgment, by which the condition of each is decided, takes place, for each, at

38 EXAMINATION OF DR. MAGEE'S STATEMENTS.

death ; and that there will be no *general* judgment.* Some few believe that though there will be a general judgment, yet that the decisions of the great day will not be conducted by our Saviour as a *personal* judge. Many believe that the individual, immediately after death, enters into a state of happiness or misery ; and

* If any, impressed with the prevalent interpretations of Scripture, not only (with myself) regard this opinion as untenable, but conceive that it can be maintained by those alone who have a partial acquaintance with the Scriptures, or are careless of scriptural authority, I beg them to observe, that it was held by one who was long and closely devoted to the study of the Scriptures, as the depository of divine truth ; who prized the Gospel of Christ above all human knowledge ; and whose heart was under the constant influence of elevated earnest piety, and of that Christian principle which regulates the life. I refer to the late venerable Newcome Cappe. This good man is necessarily included in some of the Dean of Cork's bitterest invectives against " all the Writers on the same side of the question " with Mr. Belsham, (see vol. ii. p. 493) ; and he meets with his individual portion of that contempt and indignation which the Very Reverend controversialist manifests towards " the cause at large " and " its champions." If the Dean would condescend to read Mr. Cappe's *Discourses on Providence*, or his *Posthumous Discourses*, or even his *Critical Remarks*, (in which he would find most to object,) with his *Life*, written by his excellent widow, (who, at a very advanced age, is still endeavouring, with great intellectual activity and pious ardour, to promote the cause of Christian truth and duty,)—he might feel, as he goes along, the pungent emotions of shame at his violations of equity respecting this eminent Christian. I certainly believe that Dr. Magee may urge the plea, ' *I did it ignorantly ;* ' but then it behoved him to ' judge righteous judgment ; ' and he had the means of knowledge in his power : he even virtually professes to have used them ; for he gives to some of his most unfounded charges, a universal and unqualified application.

yet that there will be a general resurrection of the dead. But the greatest proportion, I imagine, among Unitarians, regard the interval between death and the resurrection as a period of unconsciousness, (in which, to the individual, the instants of those great events must be in immediate succession;) and believe that, in the strictest sense, ‘we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ.’ But in the midst of these diversities of opinion, (*which are by no means confined to the Unitarians,*) all receive, what is surely the grand essential point, that the *future life will be a state of* **RIGHTEOUS RETRIBUTION**, and that *all shall be judged* **ACCORDING TO THEIR WORKS**. Here the influence of Unitarianism shines forth resplendently. The doctrines of many, who hold, in words, this fundamental declaration of the Gospel, appear to make it, (and, carried to their natural extent, as many are carrying them, do make it) a mere nullity. Nothing, which can be *derived* from Unitarianism,* interferes with

* I had also written, “no notion which has ever been *connected* with Unitarianism;” but the controversies at present agitating the Christian Church exhibit, among other extraordinary phenomena, the union of a belief in Absolute Unity and Unrivalled Supremacy of God even the Father, with some of the most extravagant (though I believe legitimate) inferences from Calvinism. That class of Seceders from the Establishment, who are connected with Messrs. Baring, Cowan, &c. appear to be rapidly relinquishing, and in some instances have publicly avowed that they reject, the popular doctrines concerning the Trinity and the Person of Christ. This has taken place since they left the Church. To defend their own views of Christian doctrine, they have been obliged to maintain, in the fullest extent, that the Bible, and the Bible only, is the Religion of Protestants. The consequence has

the solemn, authoritative, decisive declarations of the Gospel, 'WHATSOEVER A MAN SOWETH, THAT SHALL HE ALSO REAP;' and, 'EVERY MAN SHALL BEAR HIS OWN BURDEN.' (Gal. vi. 5, 7.)

There is one doctrine so utterly inconsistent with those views which Unitarianism cherishes, of the justice, the mercy, the wisdom, the power, and the goodness of God, and so universally rejected among Unitarians, that I should willingly admit Unitarianism to be answerable for the rejection of it, did not multitudes abandon it who are, as yet, only united with us in the delightful, exalting, and refining sentiments which we entertain of Him who is Love, who

been, that they now see that the FATHER is the Only True God. Through the influences of doctrines previously imbibed, but which they did not learn from the Scriptures, and especially from a deficiency in the cautious comparison of Scripture with Scripture, and resting too much on some parts to the partial or total neglect of others, they still maintain a system which appears to me in direct opposition to the 'doctrine according to godliness.' As some of those who preach it are men of undoubted piety and devotedness to their Master's service, I trust to their continued examination of the Scriptures to modify their system, and gradually to bring it to a conformity with our only standard of faith and duty. In the mean time, (though I fear the immediate consequences among their less-established hearers will be prejudicial to their best interests,) they are contributing to lead the moderate of the Calvinistic party, in and out of the Church, to preach more respecting the *EFFECTS of faith*; and their earnest appeals to the Scriptures will lead multitudes to search the sacred records more diligently, and *with more awakened minds*; and while, with serious desire to know the truth, they endeavour to ascertain whether these things are so, they will be better enabled to separate the doctrines of Christ from the impure admixtures of men.

‘is kind even to the unthankful and the evil,’ and who in judgment will remember mercy.—Blessed be God, that, with the gift of eternal life through Christ Jesus, is not connected the disclosure of eternal, irremediable, unmingled anguish to an incomparably large proportion of the human race! Surely he, in whose mind that benevolence rules, which is an emanation from the Father of spirits, would gladly welcome annihilation rather than the certainty of eternal bliss, if with his own happiness must be connected the misery, constant and unalleviated, of hundreds or even thousands of his fellow-creatures, for ever and for ever. Better, would he say, that all should perish. But it cannot be. The Gospel does, indeed, ‘persuade men by the terrors of the Lord;’ and it displays to us those terrors in terms too clear to allow the guilty sinner to hope that sin shall go unpunished, or to doubt the truth that ‘indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish,’ will be ‘on the workers of iniquity.’ Its declarations respecting their future sufferings are awful and alarming; but of the duration of these it speaks in language too indefinite to require us to believe a doctrine, at which the best feelings of the human heart revolt; which involves the dealings of the FATHER of his creatures in thick and impenetrable gloom; which confounds all our notions of that equity which decides according to our works; which, in numberless instances, has destroyed the salutary influence of the Gospel principle, a righteous retribution; and which conducts to, or supports, some of the most injurious departures from ‘the doctrine according to godliness.’

42 EXAMINATION OF DR. MAGEE'S STATEMENTS.

In rejecting this opinion, (which has made more unbelievers in Christianity than any other cause except the vices of professed Christians,) Unitarians are universally agreed ; and the connection is close and I think indissoluble, between the fundamental doctrines of Unitarianism and those views of the divine character and dispensations which forbid us to make his glory depend on something different from, and ever opposed to, his justice and his goodness. I should be disposed to go further, and say that those views of the divine character, to which I refer, inevitably lead to the belief, that there will be a time when all the rational creatures of God will have been purified from every pollution, and made fit for holiness and consequently, for happiness ; but there are among us able and pious Scripturalists, who are induced, by what they consider the plain declarations of the Gospel, to believe that the sufferings of the wicked according to their works, will be ended by their destruction.* Most of us, however, believe that :

* It has been my privilege to be intimately connected in the important duties of the Christian ministry, and with unbroken unity of spirit, with two excellent persons who hold the doctrine I here refer to. United by the fundamental principle of Unitarian worship, the exclusive worship of the Father in the name of Jesus Christ,—the universal principles of Christian duty,—and the grand sanctions and hopes of the Gospel,—I went on, for twelve years, with increasing esteem and affection, (and it was my own fault if it were without spiritual edification,) with one who not only ranks among the destructionists, but believes also in the pre-existence of our Lord. And with similar bonds of union, and the additional ties arising from mutual conviction in the proper humanity of our Lord, and of active zeal to promote the common

period will come, to each individual, when punishment shall have done its work, when the awful sufferings with which the Gospel threatens the impenitent and disobedient will have humbled the stubborn, purified the polluted, and eradicated malignity, impiety, hypocrisy, and every evil disposition;—that a period will come, (which it may be the unspeakable bliss of those who enter the joy of their Lord, to accelerate, which, at least, it will be their delight to anticipate,) when he who ‘must reign till he hath put ALL ENEMIES under his feet,’ ‘shall have put down all rule and all authority and power.’ ‘The LAST ENEMY, Death, shall be DESTROYED.’* ‘Every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God

principles of Unitarianism, I am now engaged with another highly valued friend, who, from what he deems the evidence of revelation, believes that the sufferings of the wicked will end in final destruction. My respected friends, the Rev. James Manning of Exeter, and the Rev. John Rowe of Bristol, will, I trust, excuse me in this reference to their opinions; and also while I add, that I have experienced from them nothing to interfere with the fullest exercise of private judgment, or with the public statement and defence of the doctrines on which we differ. When, in a course of doctrinal Lectures delivered by my present colleague and myself conjointly, I explained my own views respecting the duration of future punishments, his remark to me at the close of the service was, “Well, the Judge of the whole earth will do that which is right;” and in this conviction his piety and judgment rest satisfied.

If the Dean of Cork should read this note, he probably will not comprehend how so much union and co-operation can exist with so much diversity of sentiment. It speaks well for Unitarianism that it is fact; and the Reader, if he think it irrelevant, will, I trust, pardon the statement of it.

* 1 Cor. xv. 26. Εσχάτος ἐχθρὸς καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος.

the Father,' 'who wills that all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth,' that truth which sanctifies the heart, that knowledge which is 'life eternal:' and God shall be ALL IN ALL.*

Unitarianism a cold and cheerless doctrine! When connected with such views as these, to which it directs and generally conducts, who will call it so? They make us regard the Sovereign Lord of heaven and earth, as indeed the Father of his creatures, who scourgeth only to correct, who chasteneth only to make them 'partakers of his holiness.' They throw a lustre on his dispensations, which directs the eye of faith forward to light without a cloud; and which, (while every action and every disposition has its reference displayed by it to a state of righteous retribution,) animates the pious heart with enraptured love, and

* Phil. ii. 11; 1 Tim. ii. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 24—28. I shall have occasion to advert to this subject again, in Chapter VIII. of this Part; but I must not omit this opportunity of referring the intelligent and inquiring Reader, to the masterly and comprehensive investigations of the Rev. Dr. T. Southwood Smith, in his work on the Divine Government. I am not prepared to express a complete accordance in all its reasonings and criticisms; but to my mind it appears decisive; and if my convictions had before been wavering, this would have fixed them. The Dean of Cork, on such a subject as this, has thought fit to make himself merry, and to aim to excite the mirth of his Readers; but he certainly knows nothing about this doctrine which he ridicules; and I refer him, therefore, to Dr. T. S. Smith's *Illustrations of the Divine Government*, the 2d edition. I was going to add, that this treatise might make him think somewhat better of the philosophy and the piety of Unitarians: but I believe that is a hopeless matter. When he contemplates Unitarians and Unitarianism, he sees every thing through a false medium.

enables the enlightened purified understanding to view the dispensations of God with unutterable complacency and delight, and in some measure as He views them, who from the beginning declareth the end, and who at the beginning of this part of his creation 'saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was VERY GOOD.' (Is. xlv. 10; Gen. i. 31.)

In my judgment, this belief has its origin in the soundest notions we can form of the ends of punishment, and the most just and enlarged views of the perfections and dealings of God which we can derive from nature and from revelation; while it is opposed by no clear declarations of the Gospel, and is sanctioned by some which appear incapable of complete accomplishment while sin and misery remain in the moral creation. And yet I cannot place this doctrine on a footing with one which God has seen fit to rest upon plain, repeated, direct, express declarations of his inspired servants. If by the same authority it could be proved that the second death will be destruction, final and irretrievable,—and that He, whose judgments are unsearchable, will, for ever, blot out of existence, millions, and millions of millions, who, if his providence had placed them in different circumstances, would have been partakers of unspeakable and endless happiness, and will thereby make the diversity of condition between two of his children infinitely great, while the diversity in their characters had been too minute for human wisdom to discriminate between them,—if Revelation taught this doctrine, and made the mind more able to dwell upon the clouds and darkness which are round about Jehovah, than,

with unmingled confidence, on the righteousness and judgment which are the habitation of his throne, and more disposed to approach Him as a Sovereign than as a Father,—still must it remain the truth, that Jehovah, ‘the God of our Lord Jesus Christ,’ is One, and his name One, that he is ‘the only True God,’ and the Giver of every good and perfect gift, and that to Him Alone we are to pay Religious Worship.

The evidence for these fundamental principles cannot be affected by any want of skill or prudence in the statement of it, nor by any injudicious and extraneous admixtures with those principles, arising from the inadvertency, the ignorance, or the prejudices of those who maintain them ; but I admit that its influence may be thus diminished, and I believe it often has been. While, therefore, I endeavour to defend, (where truth requires or justifies,) those eminent predecessors or fellow-labourers whose reputation Dr. Magee has endeavoured to crush, I shall not hesitate to acknowledge what I think their errors ; and I have no other desire than that those who follow me, will, with a similar spirit, and similar views, separate the good seed from that chaff which my inadvertency, ignorance, or prejudices, may mix with it. I respect them for their great and Christian excellences ; and feel grateful to them for much of the light I possess as to the truth of Christ : but I hope I love that truth far better than I love them ; and I desire to defend them only where its interests, and justice to their merits, demand ; and to shun, in such defence, the use of those unholy weapons with which they have been so coarsely attacked.

CHAPTER IV.

ON THE DEAN OF CORK'S CHARGES, OF GENERAL APPLICATION, AGAINST UNITARIANS, AND ESPECIALLY AGAINST UNITARIAN AUTHORS.

ONE avowed object of Dr. Magee is (as he states in his Preface, p. xix,) “to canvas and appreciate
“the pretensions of certain modern writers, whose
“high tone of self-admiration, and loud vauntings of
“superior knowledge, have been but too successful
“in obtaining for them a partial and temporary ascendancy in public opinion; and who have employed
“the influence derived from that ascendancy, to
“WEAKEN THE TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY, and to sap
“the DÉAREST INTERESTS OF MAN.”

No one who has perused the Discourses &c. can hesitate in fixing upon the two individuals who are most the object of this species of attack. The Dean takes, indeed, a wide scope of hostile operation. The energetic but fanciful and prejudiced Warburton, the too hasty, yet learned and amiable Stock, and even the eminently judicious and candid Newcome,—as well as the mass of authors who in any way favour the Unitarians' views and interpretations, and the deistical writers, with whom he not unfrequently blends those who differ from them, as widely as a firm belief in the divine authority of Jesus Christ differs from the denial of it,—all, in their

several turns, and as it falls in with the great purpose of his work, receive their share of castigation.

For myself and my Unitarian brethren I would willingly say, "Strike, but hear;" but the Dean will not hear; nor, if he can prevent it, will he allow any one else to hear. He tells us, indeed, (Preface, p. xvi.) that his design was, "to *promote*" "a more enlivened spirit of religious inquiry;" but he adds, that it was also "to supply some additional security against the prevailing delusions of the day."

I know no work, the design and tendency of which is so obviously and clearly marked, to *prevent* all "religious inquiry," beyond the limits which modern orthodoxy has fenced with her bitterest stigmas and fiercest denunciations. The disciple of the Dean of Cork is like one shut up, with a master-magician, in a spacious, irregular, grotesque fortress, within which, he is told, he has abundant room for exercise and enjoyment. He gets a glimpse, perhaps, of a delightful extensive country, beyond the walls by which he is surrounded; and he fancies that he might roam there without restraint, and enjoy the beauties around him: but a mist is immediately spread over the prospect, and he is alarmed by the declaration, that those beauties are merely imaginary, that all is a dreary dangerous desert, full of crags, and precipices, and bogs, and torrents. He steals another look; but frightful spectres are made to dance before him, and he is persuaded that he is safe, only while he confines his curiosity to the wonders of the place. And if through some unnoticed aperture, the bright gleams of the all-animating sun, reflected from the grand and

lovely scenery without, should present a bright picture of reality on the walls of his darkened chamber, the skill of the enchanter instantaneously interposes some distorting medium which changes order and beauty into deformity and confusion.

It would be very difficult to produce, from the Discourses and Dissertations, any clear proof that the Author of them ever intended to represent his opponents' arguments fairly, and, after having fairly argued against them, to leave them to the Reader's own judgment. If he ever formed such an intention, in the execution of it he has been beyond measure unsuccessful. He writes as one who is confident that he is right, though he scarcely knows in what; and not only that his opponents are wrong, but that they are perversely and wilfully wrong, and that he has nothing to do but to destroy the efficacy of their arguments, in whatever way he can. If he can do it by the legitimate weapons of controversy, (though he seldom condescends to use these against the Unitarians,) it is well; if not, he employs the red-hot ball, the fireship, or even the transatlantic torpedo.

SECTION I.

On the Alleged Ignorance of the Unitarians.

If the Dean of Cork be to be credited, the Unitarians, as a body, and the avowed defenders of Unitarianism in particular, are destitute of every quality which can render them deserving of attention. The opinion which he pronounces of us, *ex cathedrâ*, has been reverberated in every possible direction ; his statements have been resorted to as authority ; and even the candid have sometimes been unwarily led astray by his representations, and, supposing that all he says must be true and accurate, have thought themselves justified in warning others, lest they should be ensnared by our specious devices.* That

* I perceive that even Dean Graves has been misled by the imposing and authoritative tone of Dean Magee's charges against the Unitarians. The high respect which I have long entertained for the eminently valuable works of Dr. Graves, in defence of the Jewish and Christian Revelations, led me to procure his *Select Scriptural Proofs of the Trinity*, as soon as published. The Reader may see, in my Preface, a few remarks on these Discourses ; and I shall have occasion, in my fifth Chapter, to bring before him a charge which has been made against me, over and over again, by various Dignitaries of the Establishment, from the Prebendary to the Bishop. I have now to call his attention to the following statement of the Dean of Ardagh, p. lxx. " It is further shown " [by Dean Magee] that they [the Unitarians] have published Dr. " Watts's Divine and Moral Hymns for Children, and a short " Catechism and Prayers, by Mrs. Trimmer, *taking out of both, the* " *passages intended by their authors to impress the Doctrine of the*

we are destitute of learning and science, of all the characteristics of a sound understanding, and every

“ *Trinity, and making them appear to inculcate Unitarianism ; and*
 “ this is done deliberately, and WITHOUT GIVING THE READERS
 “ NOTICE OF THE *artifice* PRACTISED UPON THEM. For the proof
 “ of these assertions I refer to Dean Magee, as quoted above ;” viz.
Postscript, from p. 803 to 811, or, in the 3d edition, p. 339 to 347.

The Dean of Cork’s assertion is this : “ I have this moment
 “ lying before me, a printed copy of a collection of the hymns
 “ with this title-page :—‘ Dr. Watts’s Divine and Moral Songs for
 “ ‘ Children : *revised and altered so as to render them of general use :*
 “ ‘ To which are added a short Catechism and Prayers. By Mrs.
 “ ‘ Trimmer.’ ”

When I first read this passage, I recollected that the Bishop of
 St. David’s, misled by the blundering punctuation of a newspaper-
 advertisement, and forgetting the maxim of Diodotus, *δυο τα*
εναρτιωτατα ευβουλια ειναι ταχος τε και οργην, was exceedingly
 angry with Mr. Belsham, for his supposed presumption in repre-
 senting his Reply to Prebendary Horsley as dedicated by permission
 to the Prince Regent, when, in fact, Mr. Belsham did no such
 thing, but spoke of the Prebendary’s publication as so dedicated.
 And I suspected that the Dean of Cork had founded his charge on
 a similar error, (depending on the use of a *period* instead of a
semicolon ;) that, in short, “ *By Mrs. Trimmer,*” was designed by
 the editor, or bookseller, to refer merely to the “ *short Catechism*
and Prayers.” But this supposition would not do, for the Dean
assures us, that to the Hymns is annexed, “ a Socinian Catechism
 of a most extraordinary structure ;” and I am perfectly clear that
 such a Catechism could not have proceeded from the pen of
 Mrs. Trimmer.

Desirous to know the real state of the case, I applied to the
 Secretary of the London Unitarian Society, who, from various
 circumstances, was the most likely man among us to obtain the
 book for me ; but he could learn nothing respecting it. I con-
 clude, therefore, that the Unitarians, as a body, are not chargeable
 with this “ unprincipled and treacherous ” publication.

principle of piety and humility,—and that we are therefore incompetent judges of Christian truth,—

Unable to come to the exact truth, I am obliged to presume upon Dean Magee's correctness; and the charge amounts to this. Some bookseller, or private individual, publishes an edition of Watts's Hymns, *AVOWEDLY revised and altered*. A short Catechism and Prayers are added. So far I perceive nothing wrong in this, unless the Editor so altered the Hymns as to make them say what the Author could not have said. At any rate, I have done the same myself; and several thousands of a similar edition, (*with the same acknowledgement,*) which I first printed for a particular Sunday School, are at this time in circulation. I thereby make no false representation of Dr. Watts's sentiments, even if these had remained unaltered; and I cannot hesitate, through fear of exciting the cry of bigotry, to employ what I can of Dr. Watts's pious and moral sentiments, because I cannot employ what I deem unscriptural.

But the serious part, and the only serious part of the charge is this. The edition in question places the name of Mrs. Trimmer in the title-page, as the *Reviser and Alterer of the Hymns*, as well as the Author of the Catechism, &c. If this were done *accidentally*, through the carelessness of the printer, it is an unfortunate error. If *intentionally*, I leave the unknown editor, (even if her name were Trimmer,) to the severest censures of the Dean; though they appear, I must confess, somewhat hyperbolical. Let the Reader judge. The Dean says, it “must be admitted to be *a base and deliberate fraud*: “a fraud practised upon the parent, to gain admission within his “doors, under a false name, in order to corrupt the mind and heart “of his child: *kidnapping of the most atrocious description, by which is “stolen away, not the person, but the immortal soul of the infant.*”

I might make a remark or two as to the Dean's notion, that Hymns which inculcate the principles of the Lord's Prayer, the Golden Rule, and what our Lord calls the First and Great Commandment, may possibly *kidnap the immortal soul of a child*; and on the want of caution of which he supposes that Trinitarian parents are guilty, in selecting religious books for their children: but I will proceed with the charge. From this one particular, the Dean,

he has repeatedly said or insinuated ; and he is believed by thousands, who have never witnessed the

according to his usual system of reasoning, generalizes thus rapidly :
 “ *Such are Unitarian practices.*” The editor of the book in question might be unskilful, might be dishonourable, might, by underhand means, seek to promote truth, or, more likely, (if the Dean’s account be correct,) might have ‘ filthly lucre’ in view ; but is the unskilful or dishonourable or base conduct of an unknown individual, to authorize an abusive charge against multitudes, who know nothing of him, and who probably would never have known of his production but for the Dean of Cork. If it be justice on one side, it is on the other ; and in my eighth Chapter I shall have to adduce some things of a much more serious description, and of wider application, which might be called *Trinitarian* “ practices.” But it is utterly unjust. Yet hear the Dean of Cork.

“ *Such are Unitarian practices.* Such are the fruits of a system, founded in the adulteration of Scripture truth. They, *who have falsified the word of God*, cannot be expected to deal truly by the word of man. Deceptive titles, unfounded assertions, and false quotations, we have been familiarized with, as we have advanced in our acquaintance with Unitarians and their writings. But the reader could scarcely be prepared, for a fabrication, so unprincipled, and treacherous, as this. I shall dwell upon it no longer.”

Nor shall I.—Indeed the charge might not have deserved the notice I have given it, (especially as it rests on testimony which I have been forced, by continual experience, to disregard, and yet have in this case no means of refuting,) if it had not been repeated by a soberer and more judicious opponent, the Dean of Ardagh. Strange to say, even this able writer cannot read plain, when Unitarians are attacked. If the Reader will peruse again Dr. Graves’s statement, he will see that he not only shares in the injustice of Dr. Magee, of charging the Unitarians *generally* with, what at most, some UNKNOWN individual is alone answerable for, but he aggravates it most essentially, by declaring that *they have* ALTERED Mrs. TRIMMER’S *Catechisms and Prayers*, though the Dean of Cork, his

54 EXAMINATION OF DR. MAGEE'S STATEMENTS.

benignant influence of Unitarianism on the heart and life, who have never felt its invigorating enlightening efficacy on the understanding, who have never examined, for themselves, the evidence adduced against us from our own writings, and still less perused our works, and weighed our arguments, with the disposition to know what we believe, and on what our belief is founded.

Now if the question were, whether our *authority* is to be received as the rule of faith, all this might be well: but if our principles are rested, not on *assertion*, but on *evidence*,—evidence which in general it requires not the aid of learning to appreciate, and for the examination of which, plain good sense, pious affections, and a serious love of truth are the best preparations,—it is the part of one who loves truth,

sole authority, says nothing of the kind; and, what is worse, that *they have altered Dr. Watts's Hymns, WITHOUT giving the Readers notice of the artifice they have practised upon them*, though the Dean of Cork actually gives, *as forming a part of the TITLE-PAGE*, “Dr. Watts's Divine and Moral Songs for Children, REVISED AND ALTERED,” &c.

The next thing, probably, will be, that some Bampton Lecturer will take the *Select Scriptural Proofs* as his authority, and declare, in the presence of the University, and afterwards to the Public, that these unprincipled Unitarians have published a garbled edition of Watts's Hymns, without any “notice of the artifice:” and then, following the system of Dr. Magee, will add, that they have given it “every degree of currency and credit that it is in the “power of the entire body to bestow.”

It is, however, our comfort, that Deans and Bishops and Bampton Lecturers cannot *stop*, though for a while, and in some directions, they may *check*, the progress of truth,

and feels himself to be fallible, to show that our evidence is inadequate or unsound, and not to aim to destroy our reputation, and hold us up to obloquy and contempt, as destitute of all pretensions to learning and piety, because we have not studied in an episcopal university, received episcopal ordination, or learned our theology from the Athanasian Creed.*

While, however, I maintain that the great principles of Unitarianism are so plain, and are supported by such effulgence of evidence, that they require not the aid of human learning for their support,—and feel assured that where the Bible, even in the present translation of it, is studied without human comment, and a tolerable freedom from the influence of interest, power, and fashion, these principles are rapidly gaining ground among intelligent men of all classes and

* The Dean (vol. i. p. 78) speaks of the *learned* Mr. Pierce. That eminently pious, learned, and undaunted advocate for the Dissenters, and their great principle, unshackled liberty of conscience and the right of private judgment, was buried in the church-yard of St. Leonard's, a parish adjoining the city of Exeter. A tablet was prepared to be placed there, with a suitable inscription; but the Clergyman refused to permit the erection of it. His objection was, that it spoke of the *Reverend, Learned, and Pious* James Pierce. "Now," maintained the Clergyman, "he was not *reverend*, for he was not ordained by a Bishop: he was not *learned*, for he was not educated at Oxford or Cambridge: he was not *pious*, for he was an Arian." The fact is alluded to on the monumental tablet which which was erected in the Meeting-House where he was Minister, and which, when that place of worship was sold to the Wesleyan Methodists, was transferred to the Lecture-Room of the Congregation with which, for twelve years, it was my honour and happiness to be connected.

persuasions,—I also admit, that, in showing the consistency of some parts of Scripture with its plain and repeated declarations in other parts,—in tracing out the progress of error,—in unravelling the mazes in which it has entangled many an honest heart,—not only close and accurate reasoning, but sound learning, and sometimes extensive reading, are necessary. In proportion as we are destitute of these qualifications, we shall be unsuccessful in accomplishing our work; but this is our fault, not the fault of our cause.

But are we destitute of these qualifications? I believe not.

If by *learning* be exclusively meant, a minute and intimate knowledge of the canons of the Greek metres, skill in detecting and correcting the errors of our present copies of the ancient authors, facility in the composition of Greek and Latin verse, readiness of allusion to the energetic thoughts and splendid beauties of the classic writers, and fluency in the citation of them,—in these respects, most of those Unitarians who have pretensions to a literary character, must yield the palm, not only to the giants in literature who have devoted to it their whole time and all the powers of a vigorous intellect, but also to many of less exalted reputation, who have enjoyed advantages from which we are often debarred,* and are

* In a Critique, which will be more particularly mentioned in the next Note, we find the following statement. “In a case which lately fell under our own knowledge, a lad who, from his father’s scruples on the subject of infant-baptism, had never

still able to employ in literary pursuits, an almost uninterrupted leisure. But if we may regard an extensive and familiar acquaintance with the best Greek and Roman writers, sound information as to the general principles of language and the laws and idioms of the classical languages in particular, and the consequent ability to investigate the difficulties of an ancient author, to draw from his intellectual fountain, and to feel and estimate his beauties, as sanctioning a claim to the possession of learning, (and, in my judgment, they constitute the most useful, though not the most honoured species of it,) we have among us those whose claim is indisputable, and in numbers, probably, proportioned to the extent of our sect.

But even an extensive classical culture, though an excellent preparative, is not the only, nor even the chief requisite for scriptural investigation. More moderate stores of literature, if united with a disposition to patient research, habits of accurate discrimination, and cautious but vigorous reasoning, enlarged views of the divine character and human duty, a deep sense of accountableness for the right use of the means of knowledge possessed, a serious earnest desire of the truth, and that candour which will enable the inquirer to estimate the force of

undergone this rite, was informed by the master of one of our public schools, that he must either be baptized or leave the place."

Cases of similar interference, respecting the peculiarities of religious belief, are not uncommon, especially in the education of the lower orders.

evidence, and to discover the indications of truth, however much these may be enveloped in error, and that fortitude which will make him follow it wherever it leads,—will do vastly more to promote success in the examination of the Scriptures, than the profoundest human learning, even if connected with the happy but unusual accompaniment of mathematical attainments. The many among the Unitarians who possess these eminent qualifications, (to which of course we lay no exclusive claim,) have the influence of them little impeded by the trammels in which creeds and articles can scarcely fail to entangle those who, from their infancy, have been accustomed to consider them as next to divine: their motives can seldom be warped by the unnoticed influence of worldly expectations: and there is nothing among them to prevent their employing those canons and materials of criticism, by which the reading, and sometimes the meaning, of the original, are to be ascertained, or to make them, in the search after truth, fear any thing but error.*

* The candid among our opponents may feel satisfaction in the following “Statement of the Course of *Biblical Study*” pursued in the Academical Institution at York, under the able and indefatigable direction of the Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, the Theological Tutor.

“ In the first year of his course, the theological student, who is
 “ required to have reached the age of sixteen at his admission, and
 “ to be able to read Homer and Horace, begins, upon his first
 “ entrance, the study of the Hebrew language, in which it will
 “ generally be found, that at the end of a session of nine months,
 “ he has made sufficient progress to have read, with tolerable ease,

Such, I firmly believe, are the dispositions and qualifications of a large proportion of those who exercise

“ considerable portions of the historical books of the Old Testa-
 “ ment. In the second year he reads the Prelections of Lowth,
 “ with the notes of Michaëlis, grammatically resolving the pas-
 “ sages which are quoted in the text; and in addition to this,
 “ some of the devotional and prophetic books, comparing the
 “ Hebrew throughout with the Septuagint. In the third year he
 “ continues to read other parts of the Hebrew Scriptures in the
 “ same critical and grammatical manner as before. Syriac and
 “ Chaldee do not make an invariable part of the course, but are
 “ taught to those whose ability for learning languages promises
 “ that the knowledge of them will be useful. The reader will ob-
 “ serve, that through the three first years, theological studies are
 “ subordinate to the cultivation of the languages, history, mathe-
 “ matics, and philosophy; while, in the two last, theology forms
 “ the chief and almost the exclusive business. The course of the
 “ fourth year begins with the critical examination of the sources
 “ whence the text of the Old Testament is derived, including the
 “ various ancient versions, the history and authority of which, and
 “ their relation to the Hebrew, are more or less minutely inves-
 “ tigated, according to their importance to the commentator.
 “ When the way is thus prepared, the Scriptures of the Old Tes-
 “ ment are separately examined, as the records of the Jewish
 “ Revelation; the laws of Moses are presented in a systematic
 “ view, that their wisdom and divine origin may appear more
 “ conspicuous, and all the light is thrown upon them which can
 “ be supplied by oriental manners and a comparison with other
 “ systems of ancient jurisprudence. A similar course is pursued
 “ with regard to the other historical, to the devotional, and the
 “ prophetic books. It is impossible to make use of the original
 “ text, where so large a space must be gone over; but wherever
 “ any thing depends upon critical interpretation or various read-
 “ ings, the original is referred to, and is compared with the versions,
 “ and with what commentators have written for its illustration.
 “ In this way, seven or eight hours in every week are occupied in

60 EXAMINATION OF DR. MAGEE'S STATEMENTS.

the ministry among us. And taking the Unitarians more generally, I do not hesitate in the conviction,

“ the lecture-room, besides what the private preparation of the
“ student requires. The fifth year is chiefly devoted to the reading
“ of the New Testament, with the same scrupulous attention to
“ every thing which can elucidate its meaning, without imposing
“ any doctrinal interpretation ; but as it is of the highest impor-
“ tance in the institution of a Christian minister, that he be
“ thoroughly acquainted with this part of the sacred volume, the
“ whole, or nearly the whole, is read over in the original.”—
M. Rep. for 1816, p. 406.

This statement, on which the fullest reliance may be placed, occurs in an admirable critique on Mr. *Wainwright's* account of the *Literary and Scientific Pursuits of Cambridge*. I regret that the critique was not published in a detached form : but Dean Magee is acquainted with the *Monthly Repository*, and I invite his attention to the article in question, before he republishes his strictures, vol. ii. p. 427 [381], respecting “dissenting academies,” and his amusing note in the *Postscript*, p. 291 [755]: “In some cases, it is well
“ known the individual is his own university, confers his own
“ degrees and orders, and has little more difficulty, in the way of
“ his vocation, than to find a new hat, a stout pony, and a pair
“ of saddle-bags.” It is not so in England, among Unitarians at least.

I wish it had fallen in with the object of the able Writer of the critique on the *Pursuits of Cambridge*, to detail the course of *Classical Study* at York ; but, as he himself says of his respected colleague, “justice will never be done him but by some other hand than his own.” In fact, to detail without comment would have been to praise. By the soundness, extent, and accuracy of his erudition, by his persevering earnestness and perspicuous simplicity in communicating knowledge, his judicious method of elucidation, and his depth of research, and, with all, his enlightened and conscientious views as to the *ends* of the course of instruction in which he takes a share, he is eminently qualified for his important station. Those who are engaged with him in the study of the

that, in proportion to their numbers, they rank as high as any opposing party, in sound intellectual culture and the diffusion of science. They are neither afraid of knowledge themselves, nor of contributing to extend it among others.

The same disposition influences them, in examining into the evidences of Revelation, and in promoting scriptural knowledge among the young. They are not afraid lest reasoning should deprive them of their best hopes. They see that Christianity challenges inquiry ; and they consider it as the part of wisdom to know why we believe. The knowledge of the grounds of their faith, is therefore extensively prevalent among them ; and the result most commonly is, the full and unwavering conviction of the divine authority of Christ, upon principles which neither fashion, nor sophistry, nor ridicule can overturn. Many have been led back by Unitarianism, to sit at the feet of Jesus, and learn the words of everlasting life : and numbers more, who had seen Christianity only through the veil of Orthodoxy, have been prevented by Unitarianism from rejecting the all-important conviction, that he spake the words, and acted under the immediate authority, of the Father who sent him.

Greek Tragedians, Historians, and Philosophers, have no cause to envy the more splendid advantages of the halls of learning.

SECTION II.

Respecting Christian Belief.

It is the fashion with that class of the opponents of Unitarianism, who draw their epithets, arguments, and representations, from Bishop Burgess and Dean Magee, to deny to Unitarians the title of *Christians* : or, if it be allowed in words, it is so modified, that the essence of it is gone. This, of course, draws upon us the odium of those who have experienced the inestimable value of Gospel privileges and hopes : it gives them the most erroneous notions respecting our objects and our principles of action : and, what is much more painful to us, it throws a stigma upon a cause which *we* cannot separate from that of genuine Christianity.

If the definition of a Christian include the belief that the Son and the Holy Ghost are each truly God, yet constituting one God with the Father,—that each is, separately, and conjointly with the others, the object of religious worship,—that the Son, himself very and eternal God, became so united with a human frame, as to constitute a being possessed, **AT ONCE**, of the essential properties of deity and those of humanity, so as to be, **AT ONCE**, *Omnipotent* and yet *able to do nothing of himself*, *Omniscient* and yet *ignorant of the time when his own prophecies were to be accomplished*, *Unchangeable and Immortal* and yet *subject to human wants and sufferings and death itself*,—and

that this GOD-MAN,* by suffering and by death, satisfied the anger or the justice of God, and either made God merciful, or enabled him to extend his mercy to the sinner, who, without such interference, could not, whatever were the change in his spiritual character, have obtained the pardon and acceptance of him who is represented as the Father of his creatures,—if the definition of a Christian necessarily include any one of these doctrines, under any modification which does not destroy the essence of it, certainly the Unitarian is not a Christian.

But he asks the authority of this definition. He sees nothing of the kind in the Scriptures. To him, indeed, it appears quite certain, that these doctrines were not taught by Christ or his Apostles, any more than they were by Moses and the Prophets; and that they are in direct opposition to their most unambiguous and authoritative instructions.

Able as he is, and this exclusively, to express his leading peculiarities in the very words, and indeed

* I do not use this strange incongruous compound, to throw ridicule upon those who employ it; but I would urge upon them to consider whether it would not be best to get rid of so unscriptural an appellation; and whether the fact that it is unscriptural, do not furnish some argument against the doctrines on which it is founded. If the Apostle Paul had believed, what many now believe respecting the person of Christ, how much more distinctly he would have expressed it had he said, 'There is One God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and One Mediator between the Father and Men, the God-Man Christ Jesus.' To my mind it appears impossible that he could have meant any thing else than what he says, so distinctly and unambiguously: 'There is One God, and One Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus.'

founding them upon the express and repeated declarations of Scripture, he has a better right to include under the comprehensive term Christian, such opinions as would exclude from the title, those who now exclude him.

But that which he feels injustice towards himself, the Unitarian must not practise towards others. He sees his Fellow-Christians uniting with him, in maintaining the divine origin of the Gospel; and he knows that though they widely separate from him, it is not because they *reject*, but because they *misunderstand*, that Revelation, to whose authority he also bows. He perceives that the apostolic confession was, simply, that 'Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God;' and as this, whatever consequences may be supposed to follow from it, implies no more than the conviction of his divine authority, that the Father sanctified him and sent him into the world,*—he cannot refuse to others, who admit this essential principle, nor allow the right of others to refuse to him, the honourable name of Christian.

He who believes that Jesus Christ 'came forth

* That by which our Lord justifies his own use of the appellation *Son of God*, cannot be far from the true force of it, as applied to him. See John x. 35, 36: 'If he called them GODS unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken,—say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent unto the world, ὃν ὁ Πατήρ ἡγίασε καὶ ἀπεστείλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the SON OF GOD?' The passage is also extremely important, as fully justifying his Jewish disciples, in the two or three instances in which they apply the appellation GOD, to one, to whom, in so eminent a degree, the word of God came, and whom He made Lord over the dead and the living.

from God,' and that he 'spake the words of the Father who sent him,' is, as far as belief is concerned, a Christian; and if, under its influence, he makes it his habitual concern, to obey the precepts of his Lord, to imbibe his spirit, and to copy his example, however widely he may differ from me as to the speculative consequences of his belief, I fear not for him respecting the decisions of the last great day.

We are all, undoubtedly, answerable for the use we make of our opportunities of obtaining Christian truth; and he who sees how much error leads to error, and how injurious religious error is to some, though in others it may find an antidote, and observes how solicitous the Apostles were to preserve the Gospel free from all human admixtures, will deem it his bounden duty, as far as lies in his power, to avoid holding, or countenancing, what is inconsistent with the truth as it is in Jesus. But, with respect to those who differ from him, he knows that he has no right to judge their motives, or to pronounce their condemnation. To their own Master they must stand or fall.* It is a satisfaction to him, to leave the matter

* It would be happy for those whose views are narrowed by bigotry, if they would study Jeremiah Taylor's *Liberty of Prophecy*; showing the *Unreasonableness of prescribing to other Men's Faith*, and the *Iniquity of persecuting different Opinions* (1647). No one acquainted with that Bishop's writings can suppose his faith to be below the standard of orthodoxy; nevertheless he had attained sound and comprehensive views respecting religious liberty, and the rights of conscience and private judgment, which should shame those in the present more enlightened period, whose zeal for doctrines makes them unmindful of the principles of Christian

to that great Being who 'knoweth our frame and remembereth that we are but dust,' and, 'as a Father pitieth his children,' 'pitieth those that fear him.'

charity, and who manifest a degree of intolerance and bigotry which could scarcely have failed to make them persecutors, had they lived in the days when the dungeon, the rack, and the flames, were employed to stop the progress of religious opinions. I will transcribe a few short passages from the Bishop's second section, entitled, *Of HERESY, and the nature of it, and that it is to be accounted according to the strict capacity of Christian faith, and not in opinions speculative, NOR EVER TO PIOUS PERSONS.*

"If it be pretended that every man that is deceived is therefore
 "proud, because he does not submit his understanding to the au-
 "thority of God or man respectively, and so his error becomes a
 "heresy; to this I answer, that *there is no Christian man but will sub-*
 "*mit his understanding to God, and believes whatsoever he hath said;*
 "*but ALWAYS PROVIDED, he knows that God hath said so, else he*
 "must do his duty by a readiness to obey when he shall know it."
 —"The relying upon the judgment of men, comes not under that
 "obedience of faith which is the duty of every Christian; but
 "*intrenches on that duty which we owe to Christ as an acknowledg-*
 "ment that he is our great Master, and the Prince of the Catholic
 "Church."—"He that submits his understanding to all that he
 "knows God hath said, and is ready to submit to all that he
 "hath said if he did but know it, denying his own affections and
 "ends, and interests and human persuasions, laying them all
 "down at the foot of his great Master Jesus Christ, that man
 "hath brought his understanding into subjection, and every
 "proud thought unto the obedience of Christ; and this is the
 "obedience of faith, which is the duty of every Christian."—"A
 "GOOD MAN, THAT BELIEVES WHAT, ACCORDING TO HIS LIGHT,
 "AND UPON THE USE OF HIS MORAL INDUSTRY, HE THINKS TRUE,
 "WHETHER HE HITS UPON THE RIGHT OR NO, BECAUSE HE HATH
 "A MIND DESIROUS OF TRUTH, AND PREPARED TO BELIEVE EVERY
 "TRUTH, IS THEREFORE ACCEPTABLE TO GOD, *because nothing*
 "*hindereth him from it, but what he could not help, his misery and*
 "*his weakness, which being imperfections merely natural, which God*

An earnest warm attachment to what is deemed Christian truth, requires no fiery zeal against those who do not embrace it.

I deeply regret the unguarded expressions which some of the best advocates of Unitarianism, in the ardour of inquiry and discussion, have unnecessarily employed, and thereby given its opponents a plausible pretext for charges and insinuations essentially unjust. In no way fearful of truth themselves, and seeking for or defending it, with their whole hearts, they have been ready to admit the inferences which appeared to follow from it, without always considering sufficiently the legitimacy of them, or the doubt which such inferences should themselves throw on the premises most closely connected with them. They have thus created, in the minds of those who think loosely or are afraid to think, a connection between truths which, as we believe, are equally important and indisputable, and opinions, often "the creatures of a day," which alarm the prejudices, or shock the serious conviction of others. But, what has more affected the progress of our cause among the timid or the prejudiced, is, that these inferences have been distorted by our opponents, taken out of their connection, and presented in a form so palpably absurd and dangerous,

"never punishes, he stands fair for a blessing of his morality, which God always accepts."

This last sentence should be deeply impressed on the heart of every Controversialist. It is not the *error*, but the *internal cause* of the error, which makes a man a heretic; and who shall pretend to say that the tree is bad, if the fruit (the life) is good?

that the cry of ignorant bigotry is successfully raised against Unitarianism, and it is pronounced false, because something is believed to be so, which has been adventitiously connected with it.

This is the usual way in which Unitarianism is attacked. Its great truths, and the evidence on which they rest, are almost entirely passed by: and yet, if this evidence is adequate, all the opinions which oppose them must be false.

Passing by a few speculative inquirers, whose minds, ever active and unrestrained, go on pursuing truth in all its minute ramifications,* it may be stated as the universal disposition of Unitarians, to rest satisfied with the general truth, that our Saviour acted and spoke under the immediate authority of God, that he is 'the Way, the Truth, and the Life,' possessing a complete knowledge of the divine will and purposes respecting mankind, having the words of everlasting life, in the noblest sense the Light of the World, and

* I do not believe there is a Unitarian Christian existing, but cordially admits, (however much his expressions may have been *interpreted* to a different meaning,) that the declarations of Christ, wherever they respect the faith and duty of his followers, are to be received as the word of God. I am sure that the great truth of his *divine authority* has found among the Unitarians some of its ablest defenders. And I know no process of reasoning, through which the influence of this all-important truth can be shown to be weakened by the supposition, that where the character, the dispensations, and the requirements of God are not concerned, our Lord held the opinions prevalent among his countrymen. He did not come to teach those kinds of knowledge which might be left, without injury to man's spiritual well-being, to the gradual enlightenment of intellect.

in short, the Word of God ; and that, consequently, we are as much bound to trust his declarations and to obey his precepts, as if those precepts and declarations had been communicated to each of us individually, by express revelation from the Father of Lights.

It is of such a class of men that the Dean of Cork has thought proper to speak, (in various places, indiscriminately, and without exception,) as if we were the insidious enemies of Christianity, and degraders of the Saviour.* In his Prefatory Address, designed, it may reasonably be supposed, like the rest of his work, “ to promote ” a “ spirit of religious inquiry,”

* An able and intelligent Scripturalist heard a pious woman say, “ If Jesus Christ be not God, I cannot be happy.” His reply was, “ O yes, you may, Madam ! you have only to learn to think as well of the Father as you do of his Son.”

It is truly astonishing that any thinking candid persons should ever join in the popular cry against Unitarians, and represent them as *endeavouring* to degrade the Saviour, and to rob him of his glory, because they say, as Moses and the Prophets, as Christ and his Apostles say, that Jehovah, the Father, is the only true God, and that his Son Christ Jesus is his messenger and servant. It may allay their uneasiness at the progress of our sentiments, and calm their fears for us, if they will consider, that the *Man Christ Jesus*, acting under the authority, supported by the power, and guided by the wisdom of God even the Father, must be as *omnipotent* to effect the salvation of mankind, and as *omniscient* to execute judgment, as though, according to more prevalent notions, he were united with God the Son. We cannot admit the deity of his *person*, because *revelation* teaches the contrary ; but we joyfully admit the *divinity* of his Gospel, of his authority, of his words, of his character, of his miracles, and of his present and future exalted offices. Christian Brother ! is not *this* the all-important point ?

he sets out with rousing all the fears and passions of his hearers. His own appear to have been effectually roused. Instead of preparing "the Students in Divinity" for a calm and comprehensive investigation of the truths which he had to inculcate, he at once throws his magic circle round them, and fills it with spectres of his own creation. "A CONSPIRACY," he tells them, "THE MOST DEEP AND DEADLY, has been formed against Christianity."* "Its defenders are

* During the 'Trinitarian Controversy carried on in the Exeter Newspapers, in the winter of 1814-15, the Rev. Prebendary Dennis, (one of my clerical opponents, who has recently distinguished himself by his zealous endeavours to revive the dormant rights of the Convocation, and to prove that, in ecclesiastical matters, it has, *constitutionally*, the power to put a veto on any *Act of Parliament*,) presented his readers with the following curious passage, with which I present mine, as a counterpart of the Dean of Cork's terrifying inuendo.

"That Unitarianism, so called, is, as the Bishop of St. David's has justly denominated it, actual Deism, or, as I would denominate it, masqued Infidelity, I am prepared to prove to demonstration; for since I commenced the present controversy, I happen to have got behind the scenes, and purpose speedily to draw up the curtain."—"The public expectation may be kept on the *qui vive*, for the speedy developement of a GRAND CATASTROPHE, —the disclosure of as DEADLY A CONSPIRACY, as ever existed in France or Germany. Since the passing of the Trinity Act, the secret has come out; and I happen, since I commenced the present controversy, to have lighted on the evidence, which I am IN DUTY BOUND to lay before the public."

It is scarcely necessary to add, that the Prebendary forfeited his pledge and violated his "duty." I repeatedly called upon him for the awful disclosure, which was to overwhelm me with unutterable confusion; but the "secret" remained locked up in his own breast.

“ called upon, not merely to resist the avowed in-
 “ vader, who assails the citadel from without, but
 “ the concealed and treacherous foe, who undermines
 “ the works, or tampers with the garrison within.
 “ The temporising Christian, who, under the mask of
 “ liberality, surrenders the fundamental doctrines of
 “ his creed, and the IMPOSING RATIONALIST, who, by
 “ the illusions of a fictitious resemblance, endeavours
 “ to substitute philosophy for the Gospel, are enemies,
 “ even more to be dreaded than the declared and
 “ systematic Deist.” The Dean’s pictures are usually
 such caricatures, that it is not always easy to know
 what he means to draw ; but I suppose that by the
 “imposing Rationalist” he intends the poor Unitarian,
 whom in a following page he calls the Rationalising
 Christian. Presuming that this reference is just, I
 have to add, that he represents the Unitarian as
 “secretly” employing his “machinations” “against
 the *doctrines* of our religion,” and threatening, “by
 “eluding the vigilance, and lulling the suspicions of
 “its friends, to SUBVERT THROUGH FRAUD what had
 “been found impregnable by force.”* And then we

By such bugbears the weak-minded are terrified from inquiry, and made to think ill of their brethren.

* I might quote multitudes of these terrific expressions, which
 prove, when you come to examine them, either to mean nothing, or
 to be absolutely without foundation. For instance, speaking of the
 Improved Version, the Dean tells us, “It is, in short, like the ancient
 “mantle of my country, a covering of such loose and wide dimen-
 “sions, that the reader may turn round and round in it, without
 “disturbing its shape, or depriving himself of its shelter. *And*
 “like that too, IT HAS BEEN USED AS A DISGUISE TO MUFFLE THE

have a specimen of that controversial artifice (I cannot call it otherwise) by which that which is to be attacked is made obnoxious to the Reader, by associating with it some object of greater or more obvious terror or disgust. "To aid these machinations," continues the Dean, "a modern and depraved philosophy hath sent abroad its pernicious sophistries, infecting the sources of morality, and enervating the power of manly thought; and, the better to effect these purposes, clad in those engaging colours which are peculiarly adapted to captivate the imaginations of young and ardent minds."

Knowing, much better than this Writer, the high tone of moral sentiment and of manly thought, which Unitarianism contributes powerfully to produce,—quite certain that the class of books to which he alludes, would be as much discountenanced by the Unitarian as by himself,—and alike confident that the authors of them could not have had in view to aid the objects of the Unitarians, I maintain the artful connection attempted by the Dean to be alike unfounded and injurious. Yet, in various ways and

"ASSASSIN, AND TO CONCEAL THE DAGGER." *Disc. and Diss.* vol. ii. p. 449.

On looking for this passage in the fourth edition, according to the task I have imposed on myself, I am surprised to find that the Dean has omitted it. At least it does not appear in its old company, p. 416. If he have not transplanted it to some other place, perhaps some judicious friend may have led him to perceive, that it is either falsehood or nonsense. Or, perhaps, in his soberer moments, when no earthly visions danced before him, he may himself have thought, that these come under the head of *ῥηματα αψυα*. See Matt. xii. 36.

in different parts of his work, he aims to strengthen this connection ; and in the passage just quoted he adds, " Against arts and enemies such as these," among whom, by the very terms employed, the Unitarians are at least included, " the most strenuous exertions of *all who value the religion of Christ* " are at this moment imperiously demanded."

Under the apparent influence of such terror, this member of the Church Militant declares (*Pref.* p. xv.) that if " the centinels of the Gospel sleep upon their posts, if they do not instantly rouse to its defence, they are guilty of the blackest treason to their heavenly Master." I fancy that for some years this call, made in April 1801, was not much obeyed. Unitarianism still went on, working its way somewhat silently, but effectually. But before the Dean's second edition (1809) was printed, and still more before the third, in 1812, its friends had become more united and more zealous. Its avowed advocates were more numerous. Many who could not labour in the pulpit or through the press, thought themselves called upon to assist, in whatever suitable way they could, in promoting what they deemed the cause of Christian truth and practice. The Unitarians became increasingly the object of attention and alarm ; and, as zeal is sometimes without knowledge and prudence among the Unitarians as well as others, expressions were occasionally employed, which unnecessarily irritated their orthodox brethren, or at least afforded, to the keen controversialist, a handle against them. For the last ten or twelve years, and in particular during the latter half of this period, the Unitarians have been made the

objects of obloquy and bitter misrepresentation, by Writers and Preachers of all classes, beginning with the Pulpit of the Tabernacle, and going on, through all the gradations of spiritual dignities, and almost every leading denomination of professing Christians, up to the Episcopal Throne.

Of the more modern school, Dr. Magee certainly takes the lead ; and though he has powerful support from some who have displayed more theological knowledge, and more ability in the controversy, as well as, in general, more equity, yet on the other hand he has the merit, if such it may be called, of sounding the war-whoop in the unholy warfare with which he has assailed us. The motto of the Dean of Cork avowedly is, “ There is no room for truce or accommodation.” *We* require neither the one nor the other. Our wish and our demand is justice only. Ours is not a question of selfish politics, of secular interests. We contend, and earnestly too ; but it is, not for stalls and mitres, but for what we believe to be the faith once delivered to the saints.

God forbid that I should insinuate that there are none of our opponents who have views in the controversy as simple and unworldly as our own. Some of the bitterest of them, it may reasonably be hoped, conscientiously believe that we are involved, and are involving others, in deadly error ; and that they are doing God service by holding us up to the hatred and horror of the world. Others,—I wish the number were greater,—oppose us, as I desire to oppose them,—under the influence of a warm attachment to what is apprehended to be the truth, and guided by the

spirit of charity, and by a sound mind. But where the power and honour and wealth of the world are obtained, by fierce attacks upon what the world, (even those who care not at all for religious truth,) stigmatize as heresy,—and where those attacks are not checked by regard to equity or common courtesy,—where they display the spirit of arrogant infallibility, of overbearing injustice, or rancorous animosity,—it is too much to believe that the power and honour and wealth of the world are not among the objects of the writer.* If truth be his object, it is not truth which leads to do evil that good may come.

Even Unitarianism has received the support of human power, as well as of human passions; and its glory has been dimmed thereby. Believing it to be Gospel truth, my best wish for it is, that as long as the spirit of persecution rages, its wild fury may be spent against us, and never for us.

* With the Proof of the present sheet, I have received the information, that, according to the London Newspapers of August the 10th, Dr. Magee, Dean of Cork, will be the new Bishop of Clogher. If so, as is probable, my conjecture in the Note in p. 19, proves unfounded. I regard it, however, as not dishonourable to “those who hold the distribution of these honours;” and I leave it uncanceled. I think Dr. Magee’s dignities and his expectancies dearly purchased, especially if his *Postscript* had any share in obtaining them.

SECTION III.

On Reverence for the Scriptures.

Lest any one who has not read the Discourses and Dissertations of the Dean of Cork, should still imagine that my strictures are marked with an uncalled for severity, I will give him another specimen or two of his abusive language; more will appear as we proceed.

We are not surprised that he speaks of the “ *wild blasphemies* of this sect,” and our “ *cavils* on the New Testament,” since he advances so far, by way of apology for his cumbrous Postscript, as to declare that “ the modern Socinian, (who calls himself Unitarian,) is, under the name of Christian, *the decided* “ ENEMY *of Christianity* ; and under the guise of a “ translator of the New Testament, A DELIBERATE “ FALSIFIER *of the Gospel.*” See *Postscript*, p. 365 [829].

It is of no use for us to say, We are willing, nay, it is our constant desire, to know what Revelation really teaches us, and to frame our sentiments accordingly : the Dean meets this declaration with an authoritative assertion to the contrary, vol. i. p. 39. “ In every “ attempt to get rid of the scripture doctrine of the “ Atonement,”—by which here and elsewhere he always means, of course, that which he regards as such,—“ we find a fondness for the opinion of man’s “ own sufficiency, and an *unwillingness to submit*

“ with devout and implicit reverence *to the sacred word of Revelation.*”

And if we maintain that we really feel and cherish a serious reverence for the Scriptures as containing the word of God, (after a long sentence extending through two pages and a half, in which he associates some of the most objectionable expressions of Dr. Priestley with those of certain foreign Critics, with whose writings we are scarcely acquainted, and, in order to throw a stigma upon the English Unitarian, adduces an anti-Christian sentence of a German Deist,) the Dean of Cork comes to this interrogative peroration :—“ When, I say, all these things are considered, “ and when we find the BIBLE thus CONTEMNED and “ REJECTED by the gentlemen of this new light, and “ a new and more convenient Gospel carved out for “ themselves, can the *occasional* PROFESSION of reverence for Scripture, as the word of God, be treated “ in any other light than as a CONVENIENT MASK, or “ an INSULTING SNEER ?” * Vol. i. p. 175.

* I wish here to call the Reader's attention to the following extract from a volume of sermons, by one whose writings and whose life manifested the genuine spirit of the Gospel,—I mean the late excellent Dr. Toulmin. Near the close of a discourse on 2 Tim. iii. 16, the venerable preacher says, “ But hath not sufficient been said to convince you of the worth and excellence of the Holy Scriptures ; to raise your esteem of their invaluable pages ; to excite your gratitude for their important discoveries and momentous lessons ; and to engage you to read them frequently, and study them carefully ?

“ Search the Scriptures, says our divine Master, for in them ye have eternal life, and they testify of me. The name of the Bereans, because they searched the Scriptures, is preserved with honour.

Nevertheless, I venture to say that I speak the sentiments of the Unitarians generally, when I declare, that I regard the Holy Scriptures as the unspeakable gift of divine mercy to mankind ; and that, whether I consider the views which they afford of the character, the dispensations, the providence, and the moral government of God, the disclosures they make of his gracious purposes respecting the human race, and the authoritative directions which they give, to guide us in the path of duty, I value

It was an encomium bestowed on Timothy which the latest times will hear, that from a child he knew the Holy Scriptures which are able to make us wise unto salvation. Be this, Christians, your commendation and honour. Have recourse to this treasury of heavenly and eternal riches. Apply to these never-failing springs of truth, consolation, and peace. They carry in them genuine marks of their origin, strong indications of their worth and usefulness.

“ It is an obvious and powerful recommendation of them to our serious study, that the doctrines, precepts, and promises of these divine books, are perfectly adapted to the real feelings of our nature and condition, and effectually teach us that wisdom which the wisest of men have, without them, sought in vain. Revere these sacred records ; for they enlighten the mind, correct our errors, amend our lives, and form our characters to what is lovely, useful, and great. Be persuaded, instead of being devoted to light and trifling reading, so to apply to the Holy Scriptures, as to secure substantial blessings, and to become wise unto immortal salvation. Let not their excellence and importance be treated with indifference by you ; when others, among the wisest and best men, have regarded them with the highest esteem and delight.”—*Sermons on Devotional, Evangelical, and Practical Subjects* : by Joshua Toulmin, D. D. (1810) p. 20.

According to the Dean of Cork, this passage is a “ CONVENIENT MASK OF AN INSULTING SNEER.”

them as the pearl of great price, compared with which, all the riches, and all the honours, and all the wisdom of the world, are poverty and meanness and folly. The more I know of them, the more I prize them: the better I understand them, the more I perceive that they are indeed a light unto the feet and a lamp unto the paths. I reverence them as containing the word of God, the declarations of his mind and will by those whom he sent to teach and bless mankind. I see in them stores of rich consolation to the mourner, supplies of light and guidance to the erring and ignorant, of comfort to the humble and contrite, of strength to the weak, of support to the timid doubting heart, of alarming warning to the impenitent sinner, and of cheering, nay, transporting hope, to the faithful disciple of Christ. In fine, the sacred Scriptures I reverence and value, as containing all that is needful to make men wise unto salvation.

Many of our Christian brethren speak of the Bible as though it were, throughout all its books and in every passage, dictated by the spirit of God; and as though miraculous interposition had been employed, to preserve it from the errors of transcribers, and even of translators. If the belief of all this be regarded as included in reverence for the Scriptures, then must the Unitarians, taken generally, be considered as essentially defective in this quality. But this notion is as unfounded in the Scriptures themselves, as it often has been overwhelming to their credibility. To numbers it has appeared like a mill-stone about the evidences of Christianity.

Many persons, in order to employ customary

language on the subject, have spoken of lower degrees of inspiration ; but these, in my apprehension, have no claim to the title. That divine agency alone I would call *inspiration*, by which *information* is supernaturally communicated to the mind, independently of any efforts or researches of the individual. An inspired person, in so far as he is inspired, must be infallible. To this infallibility no person in the present day has any claims ; and it is unnecessary to listen to any who make them, till they give proofs of inspiration, like those given by prophets and apostles,—accomplished predictions, or indisputable miracles.

Without attempting to determine what is the precise meaning and extent of St. Paul's declaration (2 Tim. iii. 15, 16), I may here satisfy myself with stating generally, (as my own conviction, and what, I doubt not, is the most common, if not the universal opinion among us,) that the Old Testament contains a faithful record of the divine communications made to the Patriarchs, to Moses, and to the Prophets, and of the dealings of God towards the Children of Israel ; that the Law delivered to them by Moses is of divine authority ; and that those portions of the devotional poetry of the Hebrews, which are not strictly speaking prophetical, were written under the influence of religious illumination derived, directly or indirectly, from divine communications, and of the spirit of piety which expands the understanding as well as purifies the heart.

With respect to the New Testament, the case is plainer and easier of decision.

Though unable to admit, without any authority except that of fallible men, that the *historical books* were universally written under the direction of divine inspiration, I gladly receive them as the production of able and faithful men, honestly and carefully employing their means of information, which were abundant and satisfactory. And I am grateful for the possession of them, as thoroughly authentic records of the all-important facts which attended the commencement and the early propagation of the Gospel.

The authority of St. Matthew and St. John, I cannot but regard as higher than that of the other two Evangelists; because the former were among the chosen attendants on our Lord's ministry, and, especially, because they were included in the promise which he made to his Apostles, respecting subsequent divine communications.*

The *prophetical parts* of the Apostolic Writings, like those of the Old Testament, must, of course, have been derived from direct inspiration.

With respect to the *Epistles*, taken generally, the truth I take to be this. From the personal instructions of our Lord, and from subsequent inspiration, the Apostles received, as they were prepared for

* John xiv. 26. From this declaration of our Lord, it appears to me necessarily to follow, that if the *very words* were not brought to their minds by supernatural aid, their understandings were thereby so completely illuminated with the principles which he had taught them, that it most essentially aided their recollection of his instructions and discourses, and secured them from all essential error in recording them.

them, clear, comprehensive, and accurate views of the objects, the nature, and the extent of the salvation through Christ, and of the means by which its blessings were to be effectually diffused throughout the earth. By such divine illumination, their minds were completely enlightened as to Christian doctrine and Christian duty. In the communication of their inspired knowledge, they were sometimes specially directed: but, in common, they appear to have been left to preach the truths of the Gospel in their own way, according to the promptings of their own understandings; and there are cases in which the Apostle Paul expressly declares, that what he says is to be regarded merely as his own, and given without any authority from his Lord.

According to these views, the Apostles, in their representations of Christian doctrine, and in their directions as to Christian duty, are to be regarded as the ambassadors of Christ, and the oracles of God: and, therefore, as soon as any book is ascertained to have been written by an Apostle, its divine authority, as to faith and practice, becomes unquestionable.

In this conclusion, however they arrive at it, Unitarians are, I am satisfied, universally agreed. And what more solid basis for its faith, can the enlightened understanding require? Many of us are not disposed to speak of the Scriptures, at large, and in all their parts, as the Word of God; for this involves a theory which we believe to be inconsistent with truth, and injurious to the credibility of Revelation: but we gladly receive them as *containing* the Word of God; as faithful authentic *records* of Divine Revelation: we

rest upon them, with reverence, confidence, and gratitude, as the foundation of our best hopes, and as affording the securest guidance as to the Divine Will.

But this cheering confiding conviction depends upon the belief, that the books to which we resort, for authoritative direction as to truth and duty, were really written by the Apostles of Christ; and that we have them, in all essential points, as they wrote them. And we cannot recognize, as a criterion by which to try our reverence for the Scriptures, the authority of any Church, or of any individual, pronouncing that a particular book, or a particular passage in it, is genuine. This is a matter of *evidence*; and our belief is to be decided by evidence, and not by authority. We may err in our judgments on such subjects, and yet our error arise from a conscientious desire not to receive for the declarations of God the doctrines of men; in other words, from the profoundest reverence for the Word of God, and solicitude to know what it really is.

I know it is extremely difficult for those who, from early life, have had the salutary conviction impressed on their minds, not only that the Gospel of Christ is worthy of all acceptation, but that the Scriptures are of divine authority, to distinguish between reverence for the Word of God, and reverence for that which they have been accustomed to regard as such. It is the natural result of such impressions, to make every one viewed with alarm and displeasure, who ventures to doubt, (through what he deems defect of evidence,) whether some passage, or some book, of the New Testament, had the stamp of apostolical authority.

I allow for alarm and displeasure, where the nature of the evidence, on which the convictions of the understanding must at last rest, is not understood: but it is melancholy to think, that persons who should know better, exalt these feelings into terror and abhorrence and lead the ignorant to believe, that pious conscientious men are destitute of reverence for the Word of God, because they do not manifest it in *their* way.

It is not deficiency in reverence for what is apprehended to be the Word of God, but for the authority of uninspired men, which excites against the Unitarian the opprobrium so unjustly poured upon him. We cannot consider the authority of any Church whatever, as a sure ground for our conviction, though it may furnish claims upon our attention. If the Church require us to believe that any book or passage possesses divine authority, we say, show us the proof of your infallibility, and we obey your requirements; but if you have none, show us your evidence, and we will believe, according to the best of our understanding, agreeably to that evidence.

What Protestant for a moment allows the charge of the Catholic against him, that he shows a want of reverence for the Scriptures, because he will not receive the apocryphal history of Bell and the Dragon, on the authority of the Church of Rome? and why should I bend under that of a Protestant brother because his Church, with less pretensions to infallibility, declares some passage to be genuine Scripture which, after impartially weighing the evidence, I am satisfied is spurious.

That reverence which the Unitarian feels and cherishes for Divine Revelation, and for the authoritative

records of it, urges him to weigh well the evidence which is to give a book, or a passage in it, the rank of divine authority. Certainly we should be very careful that we do not reject genuine Scripture ; but reverence for the Scriptures may be equally shown, by rejecting from them what a clear preponderance of evidence authorizes to pronounce spurious, as by decision in retaining that, which, on similar grounds, we are enabled to pronounce genuine.*

Similar observations might be made respecting the translation and the interpretation of Scripture received as genuine : but I satisfy myself with briefly stating the case between the Unitarian inquirer, and his Orthodox accuser, of a too common class.

The latter entertains implicit and equal confidence in the genuineness of all and every book of the New Testament. He considers every part as the produce

• “ If in the progress of inquiry,” says Bishop Marsh, “ excrescences should be discovered, which violate the symmetry of the original fabric, which betray a mixture of the human with the divine, of interpolations which the authority or artifice of man has engrafted on the oracles of God, it is the duty of sacred criticism to detect the spurious, and remove it from the genuine. For *it is not less blamable to accept what is false, than to reject what is true : it is not less inconsistent with the principles of religion, to ascribe the authority of Scripture to that which is not Scripture, than to refuse our acknowledgment, where such authority exists. Nor should we forget, that, if we resolve at all events to retain what has no authority to support it, we remove at once the criterion which distinguishes truth from falsehood, we involve the spurious and the genuine in the same fate, and thus deprive ourselves of the power of ever ascertaining what is the real text of the sacred writings.*”—*Course of Lectures*, Part i. p. 26.

of divine inspiration. He has no doubt that the whole has been handed down, perfect and unaltered, as it came from its respective Authors. He believes, too, with full conviction, that the authorized version is an exact transcript of the original, made by men who, if not actually inspired, were preserved from all material error in their work. And he further believes that the Orthodox interpretation of doctrinal passages is the only true one, and the only one that can be true. And, in fine, if any one dispute the Orthodox interpretation, or the common translation, or the received reading of any passage, or doubt the plenary inspiration, or the genuineness, of any portion of the books commonly received as canonical, he believes and declares that this person is guilty of irreverence towards the Holy Scriptures.*

* It is not impossible that the stigmas, so unjustly thrown on Unitarians, may in part have arisen from the unguarded expressions of eager debate. Dr. Pye Smith, in his late work, entitled, *The Scripture Testimony to the Messiah* (p. 57), gives us the following anecdote. "I have been credibly informed that a young Unitarian preacher has openly declared that, though it should be proved that the writings of the Apostle John affirm the Divinity of Christ, it would follow from thence, not that the doctrine is true, but *only that John was mistaken.*" Who the young preacher is, I know not; but I think Dr. Pye Smith would have acted more justly if he had given the name of the individual—more candidly, if, remembering the too common influence of the *odium theologicum*, he had suppressed altogether a statement of this nature, founded on hearsay evidence. Most probably, if he had himself heard it, he would have perceived that, in its connection, and as uttered, the declaration bore a widely different appearance.

But if this be still relied on, as a specimen of the *Unitarian's* treatment of the Scriptures, under the influence of "the exigencies

The Unitarian inquirer, (I am willing to say the *Christian* inquirer, whatever be his surname,) feels

of theory or the pride of false reasoning," let his Orthodox accuser weigh the following fact on the other side. The Rev. Mr. Venn, in his *Free and Full Examination of Priestley's Address to Protestant Dissenters on the Lord's Supper*, tells his opponent, that if he were converted to his philosophy, he would *burn his Bible as a book of lies*. My authority for this is Dr. Priestley's *Letter to the Rev. Mr. Venn*, p. 46. Dr. Priestley's remarks on language of this nature deserve the attention of disputants on both sides; and I will quote them in a subsequent Chapter.

Again: statements which respect merely the copier or the translator, or the mere style of the Scriptures, are often made the grounds of censure against the Unitarian, as though they manifested disrespect for the Scriptures themselves, or even for the Revelation of which they are the records. And in such censure, there is usually one law for the Unitarian, and another for the Orthodox critic. What opprobrium would have been thrown on us, if we had written the following passages!—"Let any one properly qualified to judge in this matter, read the plain historical narrative in the two first chapters of Job; it is neat, concise, clear in its order and method, pure and elegant in its expression: let him then turn to Ezra, and find if he can, a single Hebrew chapter, on which he can with a safe conscience bestow *any part of this commendation*. Let him moreover take into the account this last author's *barbarous terms*; and then let him tell me fairly, whether he does not find as much difference between these two writers, as between Sallust and William of Mahmsbury."—Again: "To whom then shall we ascribe the Appendix contained in the last two and twenty verses of the 41st chapter [of Job]? Either to the author himself of the poem, who, in his *second but not better thoughts*, conceived that he might add something valuable to his picture of the crocodile; or, which is more likely, to some *succeeding genius, impatient to lengthen out by his inventive powers what had justly obtained possession of the public esteem*. After inclosing therefore in brackets a *superfetation* that might well

himself obliged to use his own understanding, faithfully, humbly, and piously, to know what Divine

“ have been spared, we will go on, however, to give light to it.—
 “ Observe how the Appendix is ushered in : [12. I will not be
 “ silent, &c.] Is this language for the Omnipotent ? Is it at all
 “ suitable to the grandeur of conception manifested in the rest of
 “ the poem ? *The thread is too visible, by which the purple patch, of*
 “ more show than utility, is fastened on.”

I copy the foregoing extracts from the *Discourses and Dissertations*, vol. ii. p. 189 [144] and p. 197 [151]. The former is quoted, apparently with approbation, from Bishop Lowth; the latter, with indignant condemnation, from Bishop Stock's Notes on Job xli. 11, 12. I am glad it did not proceed from a Unitarian critic. I adduce it to show, that Unitarianism is in no way answerable for the spirit or the judgment which it manifests.

One more source of the censures passed upon us, for our “ treatment of the Scriptures,” is in the wild and groundless misrepresentations of those who believe because they wish them true. The following may be taken as a specimen of many. The documents are in print, and I therefore cite it without scruple.

The Reverend Prebendary, who alarmed the Public with his declarations about the “ deadly conspiracy,” (see p. 70,) repeated, about the same time, a singular charge against a “ Socinian Teacher,” which he said he had first brought forward “ in the year of our Lord God 1800.” It was then stated as follows. “ A
 “ remarkable instance of this strange conduct was recently wit-
 “ nessed in a parish in Devonshire [Uffculme], where a zealous
 “ Dissenting Teacher went round to the Cottagers, and requested
 “ them to let him look at their Bibles; from which he tore out
 “ this leaf—blotted out that text—and ran through the other ex-
 “ pression—till at length he so irritated the poor Peasants, at his
 “ ill treatment of a book every word of which they had justly been
 “ taught to esteem sacred, that he utterly defeated his own objects.”
 I suppose Mr. Dennis believed it; but I do not know why. It was utterly false. I called upon him for his proof; but his evasive reply showed that he had none. I thought it right, however, to

Revelation really teaches. He weighs the evidence which Providence affords him, to ascertain whether the books professing to be the records of Revelation are authentic ; and his conviction is proportioned to the degree of evidence, and his ability to estimate it. He respects the appreciation of it by other conscientious inquirers ; and if he cannot, in all cases, attain the confidence which they feel in the Apostolical authority of every book, he rejoices in the full satisfaction which he possesses in all that is essential to salvation : and, as far as he is influenced by a Christian spirit, he is no more disposed to charge them with superstitious credulity, than they will be, if under the same spirit, to charge him with irreverent

give information to the Rev. John Williams, of Halifax, the Unitarian Minister against whom the charge was made. His letter in answer, (which was published in the Exeter newspaper in which the charge appeared,) contained the most unqualified denial of it ; and declared “ the repeated assertions of the Rev. Jonas Dennis ” to be “ as rash and daring, as they are false and scandalous.” Mr. Williams referred to his “ respected friend, Richard Hall Clarke, Esq. of Bridwell,” in whose family he was residing at the time alluded to, as “ sufficient to refute the aspersions ” so unjustifiably thrown upon him ; and challenged inquiry from “ the truly respectable Clergyman of Uffculme, the Rev. James Windsor, to whom ” he “ was well known.” In the subsequent paper (April 8, 1815) appeared a short but pointed letter from Mr. Clarke, declaring “ the charge brought by the Rev. Jonas Dennis against Mr. Williams ” to be “ as devoid of truth as it is full of malignity.”

AND THERE THE SUBJECT DROPT. See *Letters on the Trinitarian Controversy*, inserted in the Exeter Newspapers in 1814-15 : Part iii. p. 105.—Such is the foundation on which the odium against us often solely rests.

unbelief and arrogant scepticism.* He respects, too, the less authorized, yet often not less influential, belief of the multitude; and, remembering that those who are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, he will not needlessly shock the prejudices of

* If the Canon of the New Testament contained only the "universally acknowledged" books, (viz. the Gospels, the Acts, the Thirteen undisputed Epistles of Paul, the First of Peter, and the First of John,) would any one say that we had not all that is essential to Christianity? With respect to the rest, various opinions may reasonably be entertained; but these are questions with which Unitarianism, as such, has nothing to do, and on which those who understand the subject, both Unitarians and their opponents, come to various conclusions.

The judicious Lardner, (as is well known,) was of opinion, that the "universally acknowledged" books alone "should be of the highest authority, from which doctrines of religion may be proved." The remainder "should be reckoned doubtful and contradicted: though many might be of opinion, that there is a good deal of reason to believe them genuine; and they should be allowed to be publicly read in Christian assemblies, for the edification of the people, but not to be alleged, as affording, alone, sufficient proof of any doctrine." See *Supplement to the Credibility*, ch. ii. *Works*, vol. vi. p. 17.

In proportion, however, to the conviction that any one obtains, of the apostolical authority of one of the less universally acknowledged books, must be the weight he is inclined to give to it, in deciding points of faith and practice.

Those who, with myself, cannot ascribe the Epistle to the Hebrews to St. Paul, may still regard it as a highly valuable and authentic record of the sentiments of the Jewish Christians, during the apostolic age. The Author, whoever he were, had studied in the school of Paul. With respect to the other books, the evidence appears to me adequate, (though with different degrees of probability,) to establish their claim to apostolical authority.

his weaker brethren. He cannot temporize, or conceal the truth ; but he desires to show her in her native loveliness.

Pursuing his inquiries, he thinks it his bounden duty, amid the diversity of readings and translations of various parts of the New Testament, to ascertain, as far as his means of knowledge enable him, which is the true one ; and he deems it no impeachment of his judgment, and he is certain it springs from no want of reverence for the Holy Scriptures, if with more abundant evidence before him, and with increased light in the appreciation of it, he sometimes leaves the text of Stephens and Elzevir,—or if, with the aids afforded by the learning and research of the last two centuries, he sees reason to depart not unfrequently from the renderings of the Public Version of the Scriptures. And, lastly, as he is hereafter to bear his own burden, and to be answerable for the talents which God hath given him, he cannot adopt implicitly the interpretations of fallible men, and virtually place them on a level with the words of inspired Apostles ; but, while gratefully accepting the information they afford him, he deems it his bounden duty to exercise his own understanding, and, by searching the Scriptures, and making them their own interpreter, to ascertain whether these things are so.

SECTION IV.

*Authority of Individuals among Unitarians. The Dean of
Cork's Ignorance of the State of Unitarianism.*

Accustomed, himself, to bow to the authority of that Church, whose constitutions he regards as next to apostolical,* and to see others bow to his own, our very reverend opponent imagines that the Unitarians are under similar thralldom. The public among whom he is accustomed to move, acquainted with his general talents, and imposed upon by the confidence of his assertions, universally conspire to praise, and unreservedly bend to his opinions. He has had the satisfaction of observing numbers receive their tone of ungenerous aspersion from him. That renowned

* I do not mean to intimate that the learned Dignitary feels complete satisfaction in the doctrines and articles of the Established Church; for it may reasonably be suspected, that, while he was defending the pre-existence of Christ, (which, at most, is only one of the outworks,) he would, if he could, have shown cause for believing that the doctrines of the Athanasian Creed, or at least those of the First Article, are an essential part of Christianity; and that they are abandoned with the same licentiousness, which, if he is to be credited, ever influences the Unitarians in their researches. I have often sought in the Dissertations &c., for some defence of the Trinity in Unity, and some insight into the Dean's opinions on that incomprehensible subject: but I have examined in vain; and as the Author has not, in his copious Index, even given us the word *Trinity*, I deem it reasonable to suppose that he is of that class who think that the less is said about it the better.

statesman, too, who was once the most powerful man in the world, is said to have spoken of Dr. Magee as the first theologian of the age; and though it may be doubted whether the statesman were a competent judge, the Dean certainly writes as if he thought Mr. Pitt were perfectly correct in his judgment.

When a system of faith and worship is enjoined by the authority to which, in all things that relate to Cæsar, the good subject is bound to submit, there is a natural tendency to respect it without further consideration. A dazzling splendour is thrown around it, by the worldly greatness to which its priesthood attain. Its antiquity is associated with the venerable piles which inspire the soul with solemn feeling. The wealthy and the powerful worship God as the state has directed. The seats of learning add to it all their lustre and their influence. In the hearts of numbers, too, the Establishment is connected with all the holy emotions produced by its devotional liturgy.

All these and other causes operate to produce, among multitudes, a feeling of sacredness in reference to the established faith and worship, which may sometimes operate beneficially, but which often leads away from those purer and more simple directions which the Scriptures contain. It necessarily interferes with the cause of free inquiry. And it makes him viewed with suspicion, and something approaching to detestation, as presumptuous and arrogant, and the enemy of truth, who considers the whole structure as a building framed by the hands of fallible men, and labours to bring others to the same conviction.

Among Unitarians, the case is altogether different. Unitarianism never asks for the prostration of the

understanding. Like Christianity itself, with which in my mind it is identical, it encourages inquiry. It furnishes, and it rewards, the noblest exercise of the understanding. Its advocates expect that their arguments will never be received without scrutiny. They ask for no deference to their authority, except when they state *facts* ; and this only in proportion as they feel themselves entitled to confidence, by proofs of their caution, patience, candour, and research. The influence of the evidence respecting the great points of Unitarianism is independent of any authority whatever.

To leave the walks of Orthodoxy, usually requires great effort of mind. Early prepossessions disappear gradually only. It is commonly a very painful process. It is painful to relinquish that to which the heart once clung as sacred truth ; and it is painful, too, to witness the altered face of friends, and become the object of unkind suspicion ; and to have the efforts even of benevolence cramped, by one's belonging to an unfashionable and decried sect. Where, as among thousands has been the case, this process has been passed through, owing to the simple influence of Scriptural evidence, it is not likely that the understanding will be subjected to any human dicta.

The great arguments for Unitarianism are altogether independent of authority. Learning and research often enable its advocates to notice additional evidence, and, above all, to unravel those difficulties, which arise from the change of circumstances, and the variations attendant on human language. It may sometimes be necessary for the

unlearned Unitarian to rely upon the statements which are made respecting the force of the original, or the sentiments of some eminent Critic, and upon the result of examination into the early history of the Christian Church. But his main dependence is on the clear, express, repeated, testimony of the Law and the Gospel, that JEHOVAH, the God of Abraham, and the God of Christ, the FATHER, is the ONLY TRUE God, the exclusive object of religious worship, essentially merciful, infinite in love, as well as in holiness, justice, and truth. Mr. Belsham, or any other Unitarian, may err in quoting from Schleusner or from Griesbach; but Moses could not be in error when he says, 'JEHOVAH, our God, Jehovah is ONE:'* the

* See Deut. vi. 4. יהוה אחד יהוה אחד: in the LXX, Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, Κύριος εἷς ἐστίν. Every Biblical Scholar knows that, from the structure of the Hebrew, it is here capable of various renderings. This will be obvious to the mere English reader, from a literal translation, JEHOVAH OUR GOD JEHOVAH ONE. From the Hebrew alone we cannot determine, whether the inspired Legislator of the Israelites meant to assert two distinct truths, JEHOVAH is OUR GOD, JEHOVAH is ONE; or one only, JEHOVAH OUR GOD, JEHOVAH is ONE. The rendering in the Septuagint, and that of St. Mark, in his account of our Lord's conference with the Scribe (chap. xii. 28—34), in my judgment decide the question in favour of the last rendering.

Some would render the declaration of the Jewish Legislator, JEHOVAH is OUR GOD, JEHOVAH ALONE. The *Hebrew* allows of this; but the ancient Jews did not so understand it; and what weighs absolutely in my mind, St. Mark (recording in Greek what our Lord said in the language of Judæa) did not so understand it.

Others, who charge the UNITARIANS with forced renderings, and unauthorized interpretations, (reviving the exploded notion of a

Prophet Isaiah could not, when, speaking in the name of Jehovah, he declares, 'I am God, and there is

theological mystery in a grammatical peculiarity,) actually would render the Hebrew, JEHOVAH, OUR GODS, JEHOVAH IS ONE: and so the text is made to prove the Trinity in Unity. In this class are Mr. Wardlaw and the Bishop of St. David's. Those who think the rendering entitled to examination, I refer, with complete satisfaction, to a solid, learned, and (in my opinion) *decisive* refutation of the principles on which it is founded, in Mr. Yates's *Vindication of Unitarianism*, p. 135—138, and *Sequel*, p. 66—69.

No one, surely, will contend that the passage *must* imply a plurality of PERSONS in Jehovah: and even admitting that the genius of the Hebrew language made it capable of such a meaning, it is enough to prove its utter groundlessness, that (with the exception, easily explained, of about *three* passages, in which Jehovah is represented as using plural pronouns,) throughout the Old Testament, that is, in thousands and tens of thousands of instances, JEHOVAH speaks of himself, is addressed by others, and is spoken of, as ONE: that in citing the declaration of Moses, St. Mark gives no intimation of plurality of persons in the one Jehovah, and records, in the context, statements directly opposed to this theory: that our Lord declared to the Jews, 'It is my FATHER honoureth me, OF WHOM ye say HE IS YOUR GOD:' that the ancient Jews, who must have understood their own language as well as we can do, never discovered the mystery in the word *Aleim* which the Christians have imagined: and that the more modern Jews regard the solemn declaration of their Lawgiver, as maintaining, in the strictest manner, the ABSOLUTE ONENESS of JEHOVAH. How closely they adhere to it, is well known. The following is the second of the thirteen articles of their faith, "which all Jews are expected to believe, and are required to repeat every day:" "*I believe, with a perfect faith, that the CREATOR (blessed be His name!) is ONLY ONE, IN UNITY TO WHICH THERE IS NO RESEMBLANCE; and that He alone has been, is, and will be, our God.*" See Allen's *Modern Judaism*, p. 96, 99.

When the Christian world, instructed by the Jew, shall have learnt that JEHOVAH is ONLY ONE, and that *besides Him there is no*

none else; I am God, and there is none like me:' the Apostle Paul could not, when he says, 'Unto us there is one God the Father,' 'one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus:' the Christian's Lord and Master could not, when, in PRAYING to the FATHER, he speaks of him, exclusively, as the ONLY TRUE GOD, and of himself as his messenger and servant. Implicitly relying upon this revered authority, the most illiterate Unitarian can rest here his strong confidence. For myself, I resort to it with unfading conviction.

The time must arrive, when the assertions of Dean Magee will be regarded as suspicious by the candid of all parties; but that time is not yet. At present, what he says is regarded as oracular; and numbers have been led by him into the most egregious errors. But among Unitarians the authority of names has no such magic influence. While united by some grand principles, which are felt to be a close and noble bond of union, we differ on others: and this difference contributes to weaken that reverence for human authority, which might be unhappily experienced, if we all thought or professed to think alike, and if those who spoke with the tone of authority had the riches and dignities of the world at their command.

God, then (and not till then) will the Jew be brought to the Christian's saving and sanctifying faith in Jesus, the Son of God; and then, possessing in common that knowledge which the Christian's Lord declares is *life eternal*, they will both unite in worshipping the One God and Father of all, in the name of Jesus Christ. Even so, come, Lord Jesus, come quickly.

The brilliant discoveries of Dr. Priestley naturally excited attention to his theological sentiments, and might sometimes obtain a respectful consideration of his arguments. But the peculiar quality which his writings cherish, is the disposition to exercise the best powers of the intellect on the noblest of subjects,—truth respecting the attributes, dispensations, and worship, of the Great Being on whom we for ever depend ; and himself spurning the bonds with which the demons of intolerance and bigotry have ever attempted to enthrall the mind, he would have grieved to check its noblest exercises, or to have its convictions founded solely on his authority. His constant aim was to rouse a spirit of free inquiry. He knew that, borne on its wings, Protestantism had soared above some of the densest of those clouds which obscured the sun of truth ; and he believed that, if wisely employed, they will raise us still nearer to the commanding elevation, where the beamings of that light which is inaccessible are displayed without obstruction, and in their unsullied glory.

The arguments of Dr. Priestley weigh in our minds, in proportion to what we think their validity and importance. On several points he is left by numbers among us. On others he is followed, not because they are his opinions, but because we think them true. Respect for his talents and his virtues, and especially for that noble feature in his character, which, like the dæmon of Socrates, often communicated a clear insight into the regions of truth, where the eye of others could not pierce,—the penetration produced by a pure and undaunted love of truth,—necessarily

leads us to examine his opinions, and not hastily to reject them, when, in other cases, we might pass them by without notice. But this is all. I know no Unitarian who receives his doctrines, merely because they are Priestley's.

Respecting the eminently excellent Lindsey, less need be said, because he is, at present, less referred to by our opponents. There was not that commanding character in his intellect, which was likely to give him the authority supposed to be possessed by others; though his virtues and his sacrifices, the clearness and simplicity of his mind, and the soundness of his understanding, necessarily give his writings great influence in promoting those views of divine truth on which his benevolent heart delighted to dwell.*

There is no other to whom the Unitarian public can be suspected of bowing, but to Mr. Belsham. I shall have much more to say as to my respected friend hereafter; and in this connection it is sufficient to observe, that powerful as his clear and vigorous style of reasoning is felt to be, and great as have been his services to a cause dear to our hearts, it must be a circumstance almost as rare as he himself, I am persuaded, desires, when any one adopts an opinion merely because Mr. Belsham does. It is foreign to the habit of our minds, to believe only because another

* Those who wish to understand the excellencies and the sacrifices of this venerable Confessor, and to appreciate the merits of his works, I refer, with full satisfaction, to Mr. Belsham's *Memoirs*. And, in connection with the subject of this section, I recommend to their perusal the eighth chapter of that invaluable work.

does. But that Mr. Belsham's statements and arguments should have weight with us, and obtain our respectful attention, necessarily follows, from the peculiar energy and perspicuity of his reasonings, the usual accuracy of his investigations, the comprehensiveness of his views, and the integrity of his life.

The Unitarian *rests his cause* on that rock which the hand of God has placed as the foundation of his faith. He glories, indeed, in the illustrious band, whose names are to him rendered more honourable by the approaches they made, in the midst of numerous difficulties and discouragements, towards the simplicity that is in Christ : but he never appeals to them as authority for his belief ; and he cites them, merely to show, to those who are led to despise or dread and therefore to neglect or shun his doctrines, that these cannot be deserving of contempt, since they have been embraced, in opposition to prevailing opinions, by some of the great master-minds of the human race ; and that they cannot be so dreadful or damnable as he is taught to conceive, since many, who have professed to derive them from the Scriptures, have shown, by their lives, that they possessed the spirit of Christ.

Under the influence of such feelings, the Unitarian, turning from the vulgar obloquy with which his doctrines are opposed, contemplates with delight the catalogue of worthies who imbibed, with various modifications, the principles which he deems fundamental. He is encouraged by having on his side the illustrious names of Locke and Newton and Chillingworth. When contemplating the efforts of the mind

in its emancipation from early and long-cherished errors, he is cheered by the progress of Whitby and Watts.* Among the most powerful defenders of our

* Dr. Lardner saw some of Dr. WATTS's latest papers; and he declares, not merely on the testimony of Mr. Neal, but obviously upon *his own* knowledge also, that "Dr. Watts's last thoughts were completely Unitarian." (See Belsham's *Life of Lindsey*, p. 221.) By this I understand, that, like the Bishop of Carlisle, he finally relinquished the doctrine of our Lord's pre-existence. Dr. Lardner was himself a believer in the miraculous conception; and of course his declaration does not imply Dr. Watts's rejection of that doctrine. If any are led to doubt the fact because, as Dean Magee says "it is on the report made by a Socinian witness of matter which cannot be produced," I can say nothing to convince them. But ought such an insinuation to be regarded,* "against the positive and repeated declarations of a man so eminent as Lardner, not only for the compass and accuracy of his theological knowledge, but for the strictness of his regard to truth?" Mr. Palmer was right in maintaining that Dr. Watts was no Socinian; but that he has not proved that Dr. Lardner was wrong, see N.'s papers in the *Monthly Repository* for 1813, p. 715, 768.

Respecting the ingenuous upright WHITBY, of whom Bishop Burgess says that " 'in life's last scene' there were some obliquities in his opinions," I shall have to speak hereafter. I presume the Bishop had not read his *Last Thoughts*.

"As to CHILLINGWORTH, the Writers of his Life, in the new edition of the *Biographia Britannica*, say, 'Mr. Whitaker, in his *Origin of Arianism disclosed*, p. 482-492, has produced a number of arguments to show, that Mr. Chillingworth, in the latter part of his life, became a Socinian. We acknowledge ourselves convinced by Mr. Whitaker's testimonies and reasonings; and, therefore, retract what we had before said on the subject. The Socinians, we apprehend, will be proud to have such a name as that of Chillingworth ranked among them.' *Farther Corrigenda* to the 3d vol. of the *Biographia*, printed and published with the fifth volume, 1793, article CHILLINGWORTH. See also the *Sidney*

common Christianity he claims the eminent Lardner, himself a host, as unreservedly his own. He perceives

Papers, published by Collins, vol. ii. p. 669, where Chillingworth is mentioned as having defended the Socinian cause against Lord Falkland." This paragraph I have extracted from *Gregory Blunt's Letters to Granville Sharp, Esq.* p. 169:

" Mr. Barron, in the place and work above cited,* adds, ' He (Mr. Haynes) was the most zealous Unitarian I ever knew; and in a conversation with him on that subject, he told me, that Sir ISAAC NEWTON did not believe our Lord's pre-existence, being a Socinian, as we call it, in that article; that Sir Isaac much lamented Mr. Clarke's embracing Arianism, which opinion he feared had been, and still would be, if maintained by learned men, a great obstruction to the progress of Christianity.' So long, then, as the noble family, who are the depositaries of Sir Isaac Newton's manuscript papers, which he left behind him, those especially which contain his sentiments on theological subjects, shall think proper to suppress them, and prevent the curious forming a judgment from his own words, we may abide by this testimony of Mr. Haynes, in itself probable, conveyed to us by Mr. Barron, that that sublime genius and virtuous man was a perfect Unitarian." Mr. Lindsey's *Preface to Hopton Haynes's Scripture Account*, p. xxi. 8vo. p. vii. 12mo.

Mr. Haynes had perfectly satisfactory means of judging respecting Newton's opinions; and those who are acquainted with his writings, must regard him as an upright conscientious man. The recorder of his testimony, the Rev. Richard Barron, was also a " person of great probity." Till Mr. Haynes's testimony is disproved by Sir Isaac Newton's own writings, the arguments adduced by the Bishop of St David's against it I must continue to regard as trifling in the extreme.

Not so the insinuations of the Dean of Cork, *Postscript*, p. 343 [807]: " A Mr. Barron was told, by a Mr. Haynes, (both zealous

* " Preface to a valuable collection of curious tracts, entitled *A Cordial for Low Spirits*, vol. i. p. xviii. note, third impression, 1763."

that the grievous restraints which an established creed imposes on the minds of men, did not prevent

“ Unitarians,) that he (Mr. *Haynes*) had heard from Sir *Isaac Newton*, (what it does not appear that any other human being had ever heard from him,) expressions indicating a disbelief of our Lord’s pre-existence.”* For an insinuation so gross, followed by one, equally gross, respecting even the cautious conscientious *Lardner*, I leave the Dean of Cork to answer *in foro conscientiae*.

For the Reader’s sake, however, I will quote a few lines from *Nichols’s Literary Anecdotes*, vol. ii. p. 140, 141, as given in Mr. *Aspland’s* Preface to the fourth edition of the *Scripture Account*. “*HOPTON HAYNES, Esq.*” says Mr. *Nichols*, “was Assay-master of the Mint, and principal Tally-writer of the Exchequer; in both which places he always behaved himself highly worthy of the great trust reposed in him, being indefatigable and most faithful in the execution of his offices.” “We may conclude, from his being in the Mint at the time Sir *Isaac Newton* presided there, and from his known piety and love of learned conversation, that he had frequent intercourse and enjoyed the good opinion of that excellent man.” Mr. *Haynes* served many years in the Mint-office under Sir *Isaac Newton*; and that an intercourse and similarity of opinions on religious subjects existed between them, is indicated by the fact mentioned by *Wetstein* (*Proleg.* p. 185), that Mr. *Haynes* translated Sir *Isaac’s Two Letters* into Latin.

That *Locke* was a Unitarian I continue to believe, agreeably to the evidence of Bishop *Law*, (see the Preface to his edition of *Locke’s Works*,) till there is better evidence to prove the contrary. Among the Writers of the UNITARIAN TRACTS, published at the close of the 17th century, “THERE IS GOOD GROUND TO BELIEVE,” says the excellent Prelate, was Mr. *Locke*. If the Dean of Cork reply, that Bishop *Law*, too, was a Unitarian, I willingly admit the fact, but deny every inference against his credibility. The evidence adduced by Dean *Magee* and Bishop *Burgess*, merely proves that *Locke* believed in the *Miraculous Conception* of our

* For a “Statement of the Evidence for Sir *Isaac Newton’s* Unitarianism,” see my friend Mr. *Mardon’s* Letter to the Rev. Dr. *Chalmers*.

several dignitaries of the Church, such as Hoadley and Law and Blackburne, from being almost if not altogether with him. He contemplates with still more delight, the cases of those Confessors, such as Robertson, Lindsey, Jebb, Wakefield, Tyrrwhit, and Disney, with several others, still living, who, in obedience to the calls of Christian duty, relinquished the emoluments or the prospects of a Church whose worship they regarded as unscriptural, and because they so

Lord, and that, in consequence of his production by the immediate power of God, he was *naturally immortal*, since he did not fall under the sentence of Adam's transgression, and never incurred it by personal sin. And this is all. In this there is no Anti-Unitarianism, nor even Anti-Socinianism. I suppose few contemporary Unitarians would admit Locke's doctrine of the *natural* immortality of Christ, (even though they should agree with him as to the miraculous conception); but there is nothing in it to oppose the great principles of *Unitarianism*; nor has any thing which opposes them been adduced from his writings. If any evidence can be brought to show that he maintained the religious worship of Christ, he was nearer to *Socinianism* than I at present believe.

By putting *his own interpretations* on Locke's words, Bishop Burgess demonstrates that the Philosopher believed Christ "to be **ETERNAL AND UNCREATED.**" He might as well (like Prebendary Dennis) have referred to "*Locke's Common-Place Book to the Holy Bible,*" which every one knows is **SPURIOUS.**

Locke varied in some unessential respects from most of the present Unitarians; he differed, *toto cælo*, from all Trinitarians, in many that are *essential*.

"Yes, any party may be proud of any one of these names," says Gregory Blunt, in reference to **NEWTON, LOCKE, CHILLINGWORTH,** and **LARDNER**; "the names of men who, for powers of reasoning, for talents, for knowledge, for integrity, and for careful and diligent inquiry into the sense and meaning of Scriptures, have never been exceeded in any quarter of the globe."

regarded it. And of the multitudes who have searched the Scriptures with ability, with learning, and with pious sincerity of heart, and who have adorned their sentiments by the devotion and purity and benevolent uprightness of their lives, he can point to the revered names of Turner, Cappe, J. Palmer, Kippis, Priestley, Tayleur, Kenrick, Simpson, Toulmin, Reynolds, Estlin, Bretland, &c. &c., among the strict Unitarians of his own times; to those of Carpenter, Price, Benson, Chandler, Taylor, Peirce, Hallet, Whiston, Emlyn, and a multitude of others, among the Arians; to Hopton Haynes, to Biddle and Firmin, and the English Unitarians of the 17th century; and to Socinus, Crellius, Wolzogenius, Slichtingius, and many other foreign Unitarians of that and the preceding age.

Such is the real state of the case, respecting the authority of individuals among us. And yet the Dean of Cork, from the beginning almost to the end of his volumes, proceeds upon a widely different principle. He presumes that the Unitarians, though not “in the habit of bowing with humble reverence to the sacred word” (vol. i. 188); bend their faith to the opinions of Priestley and Belsham; and that, to overturn Unitarianism, nothing more is necessary than to destroy the credit of those eminent defenders of it. I shall not here enter upon the dishonourable expedients which this Controversialist employs to effect his purpose, and display the unfairness with which he endeavours to blast their literary and even their moral reputation, through the medium of some supposed imperfection in argument or in evidence;

but I shall simply say, that even when Dr. Magee first began his attack, besides the writings of Priestley and Belsham, and even those of Lindsey, there were several important works, of recent date, on the Unitarian side of the question, which were abundantly sufficient to establish its main principles; that had he succeeded in his uncharitable object, the truth and importance of those principles would have remained as dear as ever, to Unitarians of that rapidly extending class who derive their opinions solely from the personal examination of the Scriptures; and that, long before the last publication of his work, *numerous* defences of Unitarianism had been published, which ought to have led him to revise what he had written, and to retract those indiscriminate censures, which *he knew* were grounded on a *VERY partial* acquaintance with the writings of Unitarians.

True it is, that, *towards the close of his Postscript*, he qualifies the indiscriminate charges which he had made in his preceding volumes. But let it also be observed, these charges were left, in all their virulence and universality of application, in the year 1812, when there was the same reason as afterwards to confine them to the few works which he had actually examined; still more, they are left unaltered in the very edition of 1816, to which this Postscript is appended; they even appear in the Postscript itself. The Dean of Cork is, therefore, by his own confession, convicted of bearing false testimony.

Perhaps a specimen of these charges may be necessary, to justify my censures of them. Several others

will hereafter present themselves ; the following may suffice for the present.

“ It must indeed be confessed, that great allowance is to be made for those, who have been, as it were, *rocked in the very cradle of discontent*; and who have been used from infancy to view every act of the Government, and every ordinance of the Church, *with the bitterness of a discomfited and vindictive enemy*. But it is strange that while language of the nature here cited **EVERY WHERE deforms Mr. B.’s pages, and THOSE OF HIS UNITARIAN ASSOCIATES**, they should make the want of charity the principal charge against all who hold Christianity in any other than the vague and fleeting form in which they profess to embrace it. *In the management of a controversy, it may not indeed be bad policy, to CHARGE THE ADVERSARY WITH WHATEVER UNFAIR ARTS YOU MEAN TO RESORT TO YOURSELF.*”* *Disc. and Diss.* vol. ii. p. 417 [370].

The Dean’s system of attack is this. The Unitarians, generally, believe with Priestley and Belsham. Since the death of the former, the latter is their oracle. What he says, they receive. His views and modes of reasoning are to be attributed to them equally with himself. The same blow which wounds one, must therefore wound all. By beating him down, (no matter how,) the sect falls to the ground ; and with it must fall the “ wild blasphemies ” of Unitarianism, and its “ pestilential ” consequences. By all means blast the reputation of Mr. Belsham ; and victory is secure.

* This last sentence displays the principle upon which the Dean appears to me to have repeatedly acted, in the management of this controversy ; and I may have occasion to recal the Reader’s attention to it.

If it were a question of personal honour, or worldly influence, or polemical victory, this *might* not be “bad *policy*.” But the grand arguments of Unitarianism have nothing to do with the abilities or character of its advocates. Whether a full and fair exposition and examination of those arguments are to be found in the writings of any of its opponents, I will not stop to inquire ; but I am sure they are not in those of the Dean of Cork.

But what renders this mode of attack peculiarly disingenuous, is, that Mr. Belsham expressly disavows the station assigned him by his adversaries, as organ of the sect. In the third edition of his Review (1813), in “a Preface containing” (as the title-page declares) “the Author’s replies to animadversions upon this Review,” and of the existence of which Dean Magee could scarcely be ignorant, Mr. Belsham explicitly states, p. ix., “The Writer of these Letters
“has no authority nor desire to represent himself as
“the organ of any party or denomination of Chris-
“tians. He expresses his own sentiments explicitly
“and without reserve, and, he trusts, calmly and
“candidly. No society, nor any individual, are in
“the slightest degree responsible for any thing which
“he has written.” If it be answered, that this declaration was made after the Dean’s principal attacks, I reply that these were repeated, extended, and augmented in confidence, after the declaration.

But the Dean of Cork often betrays the utmost ignorance of the circumstances and sentiments of the Unitarian body ; and I will here cite one instance, which will show how destitute of authority, on this

point, his work is, though it is considered as of the greatest authority, and numbers form by it their opinions respecting Unitarians as well as Unitarianism.

A Religious Tract Society in Glasgow, with Dr. Magee's permission, extracted from his work a portion of his strictures, which they published under the title of *An Exposure of the unwarrantable Liberties taken by the Unitarians with the Sacred Scriptures*. In reply to this, another pamphlet was circulated by the Glasgow Unitarian Fund, entitled, *An Address to the Inquirers after Truth, &c.: By a Calm Inquirer*. This tract was reprinted in the *Monthly Repository* for August 1813, with a short account of its origin by the Editor, and expressions indicating his high appreciation of its merits. On this train of circumstances the Dean founds the following statement, in which accuracy in his premises, closeness in his reasoning, and soundness in his deductions, are as conspicuous as they are in numberless other parts of his volume.

“ This I am more disposed to do,” viz. make some observations upon the Calm Inquirer's vindication of the Improved Version, “ because (as far as I know) this pamphlet contains the only defence of the Version that has been offered to the public in a detached form ; and because the *body of ENGLISH Unitarians* have attributed to it (trifling as it is) so high a value, that not content with printing and circulating it *at the expense of their public fund*, they have superadded the publication of it in *their Magazine*; thus securing to it every degree of currency and credit, that it is in the power of the **ENTIRE BODY** to bestow. *Recognised and adopted in this manner by the WHOLE COMMUNITY of Unitarians*, (who appear now to be consolidated and organized in a manner somewhat approach-

ing the system of the Wesleyan Methodists,) it is of course to be viewed as THEIR OWN *authenticated and deliberate defence of their version;*" &c. *Postscript*, p. 9 [473].

If the Dean can produce, from the least esteemed of our Writers, a passage parallel to this, in false reasoning and misrepresentation, he will throw greater discredit on our intellectual attainments, than any evidence which he has yet produced against us can warrant. I do not adduce it to parry his arguments on the greater subjects before us; but to show to those who derive their views of Unitarians and the state of Unitarianism from the Dean of Cork, that they follow one who either wilfully misrepresents, or who is too much blinded by his party hostility and acrimonious zeal, to discern plain facts, or to draw just conclusions from them.*

(1) The GLASGOW *Unitarian Fund* print and circulate the Address. From this fact, the evidence of which is in the title-page, the Dean asserts, that the *Body of ENGLISH Unitarians* have printed and circulated it at the expense of their public fund.

(2) The EDITOR of the *Monthly Repository*, an *individual* of weight and influence among us proportioned to his very important services, but responsible

* To shorten my quotation, I have passed by the Dean's contemptuous expressions respecting the *Calm Inquirer's* tract,—his censures on Unitarians because they do not give the "slightest notice" that their arguments have been a thousand times refuted,—and his modest inference, that his own total discomfiture involves "the entire subversion of the doctrines" which his work maintains: but I have adduced all which is necessary for the following observations.

to no one in the conducting of the Repository, and never acting in the name of the Unitarian body, but only for himself, thinking highly of the Address, and believing that his Readers would wish to see it, inserted it in his Journal. On this fact, and this alone, the Dean of Cork declares, that the *Body of English Unitarians* published the Address in their Magazine; by this means, and that stated in the foregoing paragraph, (in which they had no concern whatever,) securing to the tract *every degree of currency and credit* that it is in the power of the **ENTIRE BODY** to bestow.*

(3) Upon the groundless assumptions already stated, the Dean proceeds to maintain, that the Address having been *thus recognized and adopted by the WHOLE COMMUNITY of Unitarians*, it is, of course, to be viewed as *THEIR OWN authenticated and deliberate defence of THEIR version*. The tract was written by an **INDIVIDUAL** (who may be presumed to be the principal Editor of the Improved Version); and, however deliberately he may have done it, the **BODY** did not deliberate on the subject. After it had been printed and circulated by a *very small part* of that body, the Glasgow Unitarian Fund, it was reprinted by another **INDIVIDUAL**, the Editor of our Repository. And, **THEREFORE**, being thus recognized, &c. Q. E. D.

* The *Address* was never circulated in England, in a separate form, nor indeed does any bookseller's name appear in the title-page; and no one of the many Unitarian book-societies in South Britain, as far as I have been able to learn, have inserted it in their Catalogues, for distribution among their members.

ing the system of the Wesleyan Methodists,) it is of course to be viewed as THEIR OWN *authenticated and deliberate declaration of their version;*" &c. *Postscript*, p. 9 [173].

If the Dean can produce, from the least esteemed of our Writers, a passage parallel to this, in false reasoning and misrepresentation, he will throw greater discredit on our intellectual attainments, than the evidence which he has yet produced against us warrants. I do not adduce it to parry his argument on the greater subjects before us; but to show those who derive their views of Unitarians and the state of Unitarianism from the Dean of Cork, that they follow one who either wilfully misrepresents or who is too much blinded by his party hostility and acrimonious zeal, to discern plain facts, or to draw just conclusions from them.*

(1) The *GLASGOW Unitarian Fund* print and circulate the Address. From this fact, the evidence which is in the title-page, the Dean asserts, that the *Body of ENGLISH Unitarians* have printed and circulated it at the expense of their public fund.

(2) The *EDITOR of the Monthly Repository*, an individual of weight and influence among us proportioned to his very important services, but respon-

* To shorten my quotation, I have passed by the Dean's temptuous expressions respecting the *Calm Inquirer's* transgressions on Unitarians because they do not give the "sufficient notice" that their arguments have been a thousand times refuted—and his modest inference, that his own total discomfiture involves "the entire subversion of the doctrines" which he maintains: but I have adduced all which is necessary for the following observations.

In these remarks I have not adverted to the assertion that "the whole community of Unitarians" appear now to be consolidated and organized in a manner somewhat approaching to the system of the Wesleyan Methodists," because it is given in the form of conjecture. But if, as in other cases, some learned Dignitary should unfortunately rely on the Dean of Cork, and, presuming that his assertion of *appearance* must have some foundation in *reality*, should venture to go one step farther, and declare that the Unitarians are so consolidated and organized, he would express what many Unitarians wish to see, but any well-informed Unitarian would tell him, it is a wish which cannot speedily be accomplished. The declaration would, however, be just as true, as a multitude of others which the Dean of Cork has made against us.

CHAPTER V.

ON THE DEAN OF CORK'S STATEMENTS RESPECTING
THE AUTHOR OF THIS WORK.

WILL Dr. Magee presented the Public with his fourth edition, he manifested a very slight acquaintance with the writings of Unitarians; and his knowledge of them appeared to be nearly limited to those of Dr. Priestley and Mr. Belsham. Prior, however, to the first publication of his Discourses, there were various recent works, which required his examination, before he presumed to condemn them as he has done: and since that period, numerous tracts and volumes have appeared, in defence of the principles of Unitarianism; many of which it is obvious that Dr. Magee has not seen, though all of them are included in the following unlimited and indiscriminating censures.

“His opinions, [Mr. Belsham's] as undermining the best interests of human kind; and his style, *like that of all the writers of the same side the question*, as tending to overbear by an imposing confidence of tone, and a familiar and frontless assumption of superiority, can scarcely be received without indignation, or met without warmth.” *Disc. and Diss.* vol. ii. p. 493 [413].

On the word *indignation*, Dr. Magee adds, in a note,

“I cannot allow myself to employ the term which Mr. B. does not scruple to combine with this, on much slighter provocation,—‘*contempt*.’ (*Review*, p. 64.) And yet,—to

pass from Mr. Belsham to *the ENTIRE CLASS of his fellow-labourers*, and to speak, not of the individual, but of the cause at large and its champions,—what can be more fitly calculated to excite even the feeling which that term expresses, than *the impotent and arrogant attempts of a few loquacious sciolists, directed against the sublime and solid truths of Revelation?*”

This curious passage remains unaltered in the fourth edition.

If the Dean of Cork had not, in his *Postscript*, entered somewhat more fully into particulars, I should, contentedly and in silence, have borne my share of this contemptuous reproach. The Unitarian advocate gets accustomed to such things; and it is seldom that they excite uneasy emotions, except from the idea that his cause may possibly suffer by the aspersions scattered upon himself, and the sorrow that any thing, which is supposed to be religious truth, should be defended by the exercise of such unholy passions.

Near the close of his *Postscript*, p. 323 [787], the Dean expresses the wish, that the “strong language” which in many places he had been “forced to employ,” in his observations upon Unitarian writers, might be considered, “as designed to apply only to Unitarians of a certain class;”^{*} and he makes a saving

* A notable specimen of the Dean’s random sweeping censures, occurs in his *Postscript*, p. 48 [512]. After quoting some passages from LOCKE, to show that this eminent philosopher and scripturalist held views, respecting the nature of Christ, which materially differ from those of the present believers in his simple humanity, and one from GROTIUS, which in no way proves his orthodoxy, and which few Unitarians would hesitate to employ,—the Dean thus proceeds. “Why these two eminent writers were not refer-

exception in behalf of "Dr. Estlin, Mr. Frend, and Dr. Carpenter." If he really had seen ground for such an exception, and had been led to make it, not by the vain hope of sowing the seeds of discord among us, but by a sense of justice, it strikes me that he should have made it earlier. The multitudes who know nothing of Unitarian writers, but from Dr. Magee, will not be so likely to remember the exceptions, as the frequently stated general rule. His

"red to on the present subject," the interpretation of Rom. i. 3, "the Reader is now probably enabled to conjecture. *But what will be his reflections when he learns, that Mr. Belsham, Dr. Carpenter, and ALL THEIR UNITARIAN FELLOW-LABOURERS, claim these very writers as CONCURRING in THEIR opinions touching the mere human nature of Christ, and UNBLUSHINGLY assert this in EVERY PUBLICATION.*"

What, I would ask in return, will be his reflections, when he learns that the whole sentence is a tissue of false assertions? It is not true, that Mr. *Belsham* ever claimed *Grotius* as concurring in his opinions touching the mere human nature of Christ. It is not true, that Dr. *Carpenter* ever claimed either *Grotius* or *Locke*, as concurring with him in those opinions. It is not true, that all their fellow-labourers do so. It is not true, that we do so in every publication. *LOCKE*, undoubtedly, we claim as ours; and ours he is: but if Dean Magee, or Bishop Burgess, can produce a Unitarian Writer who represents even *Locke* as concurring in the opinions common among believers in the simple humanity, respecting the birth and nature of Christ, he can do what I cannot.

I will not attribute the falsehoods in the above quotation, to any thing but an unfortunate confusion of mind, produced by blind party-zeal and personal resentment, which makes the Dean imagine the reveries of his own imagination to be realities; but I do say, that when a man can write thus, he forfeits all claim to unsuspecting reliance on his assertions, and ceases to be a credible witness in the controversy.

praises are sparing and qualified; his vituperative charges, abundant and unlimited.

But, independently of the fact, that we repeatedly find, in the *Postscript*, such expressions as “ Mr. Belsham, Dr. Carpenter, and all their Unitarian fellow-labourers,” and that I must, therefore, be regarded by Dr. Magee’s Readers, as one of those “ few other individuals” who, he tells them, *Postscript*, p. 337 [801], with Mr. Belsham, have promulgated “ opinions *shocking to EVERY PIOUS mind, revolting to EVERY WELL-INFORMED understanding*, essentially repugnant to Christian doctrines, and essentially subversive of Christian principles,”—I am not without my portion of direct censure.* For instance, in the *Postscript*, p. 67 [531], the Reader is informed, that “ *Mr. Belsham* does not stand *alone*, in the **PILLORY** ” which the Bishop of St. David’s “ has erected ” “ for the

* “ The *grossest ignorance* (and especially of the original language of the New Testament) is displayed by them,” the Editors of the Improved Version, “ and their assistant Commentators, in every page of their compilations.” *Postscript*, p. 4 [468]. I am not certain whether the Dean means to include me in this good company; though he afterwards, p. 46 [510], speaks of “ *Mr. Belsham’s* fellow-labourer in support of the Unitarian Version, Dr. Carpenter.” If he do, I think it an honour to share in this stigma of the “ *grossest ignorance*,” with the Editors of the Improved Version, and their assistant Commentators, *Locke, Peirce, Chandler, Taylor, Lindsey, Priestley, Jebb, Wakefield, Cappe, Simpson, &c.*

The Dean is so fond of vituperative language, that he gives us *Elsner’s* judgment of this “ most pestilential sect,” the Socinians,—“ *Græcæ linguæ fere expertes sunt.*” Those who have read the writings of the Socinians, *Enjedinus, Crellius, Wolzogenius, &c.* know that this censure is altogether groundless.

exposure" of certain "*misdemeanors*;" "but *Dr. Carpenter* also is there presented as *involved in the disgrace*."* The friends of truth have often been

* The Dean refers here to p. 75-96 of Bishop Burgess's tract entitled *The Bible and nothing but the Bible the Religion of the Church of England* (1815). I had previously learnt, from some Review, that the Bishop had included me in his censures; but though I repeatedly applied for his book, through the usual channels, I was not able to procure it, till I met with a second-hand copy, near the close of 1817.

When I reprint my *Unitarianism &c.*, I expect to find a suitable opportunity of replying to the Bishop's objections against my arguments. At present, and in a subsequent Note, I must notice what the assertion of Dr. Magee requires, respecting my citations of *Schleusner*.

Bishop Burgess informs his Readers (p. 59), that the Unitarians quote *Schleusner* "with as much complacency as if he was a favourer of their opinions;" and that they "have never told the public, that *his* interpretation of those passages of the New Testament, which contain the principal doctrines of Christianity, is *contrary to their own*." And yet it will shortly be seen, that I have expressly said, in connection with a reference to *Schleusner* of some importance, that *no one can suspect him of being a Unitarian*, and that he attributes the application of the title *Son of God* to our Lord, in part to the *peculiarity of his NATURE*. But the Bishop sees only with the eyes of terror, and we know, *Timor animi oculis obficit*.

In p. 76, speaking of Mr. Belsham and Dr. Carpenter, and of them only, (in reference to their interpretations of Heb. i. 2.) the Bishop declares, "And *THEY* have the *effrontery* to refer to *SCHLEUSNER*, for the meaning of *αὐτῶν* and *διὰ*, as if he concurred in their translation." Must not the Reader presume, that the Bishop certainly *knew*, that, whether justly or not, I did thus refer to *Schleusner*, before he charged me with this "effrontery?" Could a learned studious Prelate, sitting in the calm retirement of his palace, throw a stigma upon another, for doing that which he

pilloried, or, in other words, held up to popular odium; but, as long as they have a good conscience and truth on their side, they may well acquit themselves like men.

I think it sufficient to refer the Reader to the note on the last paragraph, in reference to the Bishop's unfounded charges; but I must here take notice of some, which the Dean has himself made or adopted.

Before, however, I proceed, I shall state two of the Dean's canons, which will be found of frequent application in this and succeeding chapters.

I. *Inverted Commas denote QUOTATION.* It is, says the Dean, "*the ESTABLISHED MEANING of the form,*" it "*UNEQUIVOCALLY implies*" this. And if there is no intimation of the contrary, all that is included

has not done? Yet the fact is so. I have not even mentioned the name of Schleusner, nor in any way referred to him, in connection with this text. Such is the effect of intolerant zeal.

As to the charges brought against Mr. Belsham, I need not say a word. Our veteran advocate's victorious reply to the Bishop of St. David's, (annexed to *A Letter to the Unitarian Christians in South Wales*), including his *Estimate of his Lordship's Character and Qualifications as a Theological Polemic*, must have convinced the Bishop, that, as far as he is himself concerned, the controversy is ended. His most judicious friends must wish, that he would leave Mr. Belsham and the Unitarians to themselves. His proper sphere of action is that charge, to the duties of which he is, I believe, seriously, conscientiously, and unremittingly devoted; and if, by precept and example, he should teach his clergy, to seek for their religion in *the Bible and nothing but the Bible*, he will wander less from the 'good old way,' than by leading them to search in Suidas for "unlicensed greek," or by giving them "THE ATHANASIAN CREED" as "*a Comment on the words of our Saviour*" in John xvii. 3. See *The Bible*, &c., p. 131.

in these inverted commas, is to be considered as "one continued quotation."*

II. We are not to select and reject from any passage which we profess to quote, just what we find convenient; but to quote all or none.†

* "Here," says the Dean of Cork, in reference to *Calm Inq.* p. 173, "is the quotation from *Schleusner*, in the precise form in which Mr. Belsham has given it, even to the *inverted commas*. Now in the first place, it is surely a GROSS FALSIFICATION of his author, to give, as one continued quotation from him, (as the established meaning of the form here employed by Mr. Belsham UNEQUIVOCALLY implies,) that, which is an arbitrary selection of words drawn violently together from various parts of a lengthened context, in the present case amounting to more than an entire column of close printing." *Postscript*, p. 59 [523].

In Chapter VII., I shall again advert to this passage, to say something in vindication of Mr. Belsham; at present I only notice the following facts. The *Bishop of St. David's*, in quoting from *Schleusner* on *πορευω*, (*The Bible*, &c. p. 88,) commits the very error (though to a less extent) here urged against Mr. Belsham as a GROSS FALSIFICATION; and, the *Dean of Cork*, as will appear immediately, takes a "Gloss" which the Bishop had compounded by "an arbitrary selection of words" from two Unitarian Authors, marks it as "one continued quotation," and then, (without referring to the Bishop,) attributes it to both those said Authors, in neither of whom is it to be found. But I have long discovered, that the Dean has one law for Bishops and Clergy, (unless any of these have given him personal offence,) and another for the Unitarian. If any one of us had been guilty of such an offence, we should have been told of "the manner in which modern Unitarians abuse the credulity of their Readers," and of "the SHAMEFUL DISINGENUOUSNESS with which the Critics of this school conduct their inquiries." *Postscript*, p. 105 [569].

† "He [Dr. Magee] is so whimsical as to require of those with whom he is engaged in discussion, to quote all or none, of any

By these two principles I am perfectly willing to abide ; and as the Dean lays them down himself, and censures others severely for departing from them, he cannot deny the justice of my applying them to him.

Cases will present themselves, in the following chapters, (and numbers more might be cited,) in which the Dean has so wildly departed from his own canons, that the candid Reader will be convinced that his CITATIONS *cannot be relied upon without examination*. Some minor specimens of unfairness, respecting myself, will now be laid before him.

The first does not mislead as to its general import ; but it is obviously designed to make that import appear as frigid and forceless as possible.

“ UNITARIAN GLOSS ” on John iii. 31. “ [He who cometh with a divine commission is superior to all : he who is of the earth, manifests the origin of his teaching, and his words have not their requisite authority. He who cometh with a divine commission, is superior to all.] *Calm Inq.* p. 55. *Unit. the Doct. &c.* p. 261.” *Postscript*, p. 83 [547].

Now here the passage in crotchets is marked, by

“ passage which they profess to give as his.” The Unitarians, he says, “ in instances without number,” “ *select and reject* from any “ sentence which they profess to quote, just what they find convenient.” *Postscript*, p. 269 [733].

Of course this canon does not apply to the quotation of detached expressions, quoted as such ; but to those cases in which passages are cited as the ground of argument. Nevertheless, in quoting such detached expressions, if they have a different aspect, when taken out of their connection, from what they would have had in it, controversial equity requires that the connection should be stated.

the Dean, as a continued quotation; and, oddly enough, *two* books are cited as the source. This led me to examine the quotation; and I found that it is taken from neither one nor the other, but is made up, from both, upon the principle of *selection and rejection*.*

In the next page, the Dean quotes a “Unitarian Gloss” on John vi. 62, which, without explanation, is represented as quoted from my volume, and, of course, is to be attributed to the Author of it; whereas, if the penetrating eye of the Dean had glanced to the note which begins at the foot of the page where it occurs, and to p. 261, he might have perceived, that I *reject* the interpretation he has given, for one which appeared to me more correct, as well as more literal. Another proof, (though of trifling importance in comparison with some respecting Mr. Belsham,) that, either from intention, or carelessness, or the darkness of prejudice, the Dean’s unexamined testimony is not admissible.

The note in p. 34 [498] † brings a charge against

* Since I wrote this paragraph, I have discovered that the *quotation* is derived from Bishop Burgess’s “Specimens of Unitarian Glosses,” designed to “show their mode of evading the plain meaning of Scripture.” The Bishop, however, neither marks the Gloss as a quotation, nor refers to the sources of it. Here the Bishop unwittingly misleads the Dean.

† This closely printed *Note*, (which extends through more than *sixteen pages*, occupying the whole of each, excepting two lines of *text*,) contains, in the body of it, Scholia inserted in brackets. When the Reader considers that these Sub-notes are SCHOLIA on a NOTE to the POSTSCRIPT of the APPENDIX to the DISSERTATIONS subjoined to the DISCOURSES on Atonement and Sacrifice, he may

me, which, *if just*, makes *me* a suspicious witness; or, if groundless, proves, (even without the more condemning proofs I shall hereafter adduce,) that my conclusion, just stated, is correct and true. The Dean adduces, in his preceding page, several statements from Schleusner, (under the head of υἱος and ανθρωπος,) clearly indicating that eminent Critic's own belief, that the appellation *Son of God* implies that our Lord possessed a nature vastly superior to that of men; and proving, that he considered the appellation *Son of Man*, as referring to his being born of a virgin, and denoting his dignified rank as the Messiah. The Dean then subjoins the following paragraph.

“ One would hardly think, after reading the passages which have been here adduced from *Schleusner*, that any writer could have the hardihood to mention *his* name in connection with the assertion, that our Lord was not called *the Son of God* in a sense implying any *peculiarity* of nature, or in any other than that of the common Jewish idiom, under which, the title was equally applicable to believers at large. And yet this has been expressly done by *Dr. Carpenter*, who builds the

form some idea of the chaos, which the “ Professor of Mathematics” presents to him who has to examine his work, and, if possible, digest it. This *Postscript* contains 367 pages : the greater part of it consists of very long notes; and the whole without a single marked resting-place, or any divisions for reference. Neither his mathematics nor his scholarship have taught him, that “ Order is heaven's first law.” The Dean surely did not intend to be answered. That he did not wish it, we know : “ I shall certainly feel most sincere satisfaction,” he says, vol. ii. p. 492 [419], “ if it be allowed to continue to work its silent way, without the *noise and exasperation of controversy*.”

whole of his Unitarian position, touching this phrase, upon *Schleusner*, 'whom' (he adds, to give his argument the greater effect) 'no one can suspect of being an Unitarian.' *Unit. the Doct. &c.* p. 174. Thus is the unsuspecting reader deluded, and by those who scarcely ever have the words 'truth' and 'candour' out of their *mouths*. The very article 'Υιος too, from which I have adduced *Schleusner's* own words, is the very article to which reference is thus made, for the establishing by *Schleusner's name*, the direct contrary of *Schleusner's opinions*." *Postscript*, p. 34 [498].

Such is the charge. I now offer the Reader the fact. In my remarks on John xx. 31, (*Unitarianism &c.* p. 172,) I consider the *scriptural force* of the appellation *Son of God*; and maintain that it carries with it no reference to nature,* but simply denotes

* Believing, as I do, the genuineness of St. Luke's Introduction, I of course admit, that the appellation is there given to our Lord (ch. i. 35), in connection with the supernatural circumstances attending his birth. As I have elsewhere stated, (*Unitarianism &c.*, p. 356,) I consider the import of the expression at the close of the verse, to be as follows: "Wherefore thy holy offspring 'shall be called Son of God,' shall be designated as one peculiarly the object of the divine care and concern, peculiarly honoured with the divine favour, and specially appointed by God to a glorious and important commission." Even if the common interpretation of the Angel's words in this verse were the true one, and our Lord were supernaturally conceived, and if the appellation, in *this* instance, really referred to a miraculous intervention of divine power,—still I cannot admit it to have any thing to do with *peculiarity of nature*, till it be *proved*, that the miraculous production of a human being, must cause the person so produced, to have a different nature from his fellow-men.

My unwavering conviction in the simple humanity of our Lord, would be no more affected by the belief that his birth was brought about by the miraculous agency of divine power, than it is by his

that he to whom it is applied, is *a person favoured by God, and peculiarly eminent as to character or privileges or office*. This assertion I illustrate by a reference to various texts, and some collateral expressions ; and in the note subjoined, is the following passage, which I must quote entire.

“ Schleusner (whom no one can suspect of being an Unitarian), after having pointed out several peculiarities in the scriptural use of the word *Son*, says, ‘ In the N. T. every one ‘ is called *Son of God*, who is like God, beloved by him, and ‘ favoured by him with peculiar blessings, who truly and piously ‘ serves God, and obeys his will.’ He then states what he regards as the peculiar grounds of the application of the term to Christians, and to our Lord. In the last case he refers it in part (but without evidence) to peculiarity of *nature* ; and he assigns as the reason for the employment of the term in reference to Christ, the use of it in the O. T. in reference to the Messiah, and the phraseology of the O. T. which designated ‘ kings, magistrates, and in short all who were considered as ‘ holding the place of God among men, by the title of *Sons of ‘ God*.’ It was obviously in this last sense that Nathanael employed the term, (see John i. 49, comp. ver. 45) ; but I consider the words of our Lord, (John x. 36,) as assigning the ground and justification of his own employment of it.” *Unitarianism &c.* p. 174.

resurrection, his ascension, his present incorruptibility and immortality, and the supernatural powers given him, while on earth, to prove his divine authority.

The difficulty which I feel respecting the common interpretation of Luke i. 35, does not exist, as the Dean maintains, *Postscript*, p. 324 [788], “ only in reference to the Unitarian hypothesis.” I doubt the supposed fact, because the words of Luke do not require such an interpretation, and various expressions and circumstances in the Gospel history, render it, to say the least, highly improbable.

The case is now before the Reader ; and I maintain, (1) That the Dean's assertion is utterly groundless, that I build "the whole of my Unitarian position touching the phrase, upon *Schleusner*;" since I build, and avowedly build it, upon the *scriptural use* of the appellation, and merely adduce Schleusner's declaration on the *general* force of it, for the sake of those who would question the result of my own examination. (2) In no way whatever, do I adduce Schleusner as authority for the position, that the appellation, as applied to our Lord, implies no peculiarity of nature ; and so far from concealing Schleusner's own opinion on the subject, I expressly state it, though I add the fact, that he assigns no proof of it. (3) So far from myself maintaining that the appellation, as applied to our Lord, was "EQUALLY applicable to believers at large," I expressly state, that "I consider the words of our Lord, (John x. 36,) as assigning the ground and justification of his own employment of it." Had the Dean examined my reference, he would have seen that, in my opinion, the appellation designates our Lord, as one *whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world.*—See p. 64 of this volume.

If any opponent of Unitarianism, after following my examination of this and similar assertions of the Dean of Cork, continue to depend upon his *assertions* as evidence, he must have system, and not truth, as his object. They often appear to me to justify his own words, "There are things which a man may write, which he could not easily command countenance to say."—*Postscript*, p. 206 [670].

My interpretation of 1 Pet. iii. 19, (*Unitarianism &c.*, p. 227,) furnishes, the Dean informs his Readers, p. 97 [561], "one of the most complete specimens of Unitarian exposition to be met with in the same narrow compass;" and he refers them to the "remarks of the Bishop of St. David's," "and particularly his animadversions on the UNFAIR use made of Schleusner's name by Dr. Carpenter." On the last point, I must say something in the note below*. My views

* In my remarks on 1 Pet. iii. 19, I refer *ἀνέβη*, as others have done, to the *ascension* of our Lord. After some remarks on the separate clauses, I add, "It appears to me clear, that the agency of Christ here spoken of, was subsequent to his resurrection; that the direct reference of *ἀνέβη*, *having gone*, is to his ascension (see Schleusner); and that therefore," &c. The Reader must at once perceive, that I cite Schleusner, simply as giving *authority* for referring *ἀνέβη*, by itself, to Christ's *going* (to heaven). "In this reference," says the Bishop, (p. 88) "there are two very culpable misrepresentations. Schleusner does not translate the *ἀνέβη* of ver. 19, the verse in question, but of ver. 22, where it is expressly limited to the *resurrection* of Christ;" (the good Bishop means "the *ascension* of Christ;" if a Unitarian had made the blunder, the Dean of Cork would have talked about "bad faith," "artifice and dishonesty," "gross and deliberate imposition," as he often does on errors no more unpardonable): "and even there, Schleusner does not give it the sense of *ascending*, but *returning*, to Heaven"—"which sense asserts that very pre-existence which Dr. Carpenter is denying."

The case is this. I express my own decided opinion that the direct reference of *ἀνέβη* is to our Lord's ascension. Of this I was myself convinced, from examining the passages where the Greek verb occurs, and considering the context in question. But others might imagine that it *cannot* have any such reference; and as the authority of Schleusner might weigh, where mine would be regarded as nothing, I referred to him; and he bears me out fully.—If the candid discriminating Reader, (and to such only I

of the passage itself I am prepared to defend, if Providence continue my life, to reprint, as I hope speedily to do, the volume in which I have advanced them ;

appeal,) think that my words, strictly taken, imply that Schleusner interprets *πορευθεῖς*, in this particular case, as I do, I have fallen under the censure of the Poet, *Brevis esse laboro, Obscurus fio* ; and the Bishop has *some* ground for one of his counts. For the other, he has none. I in no way whatever cite *Schleusner* as denying the pre-existence of our Lord. His own additional association of *returning* (to heaven), is of no consequence in the argument on this text, which merely respects the question, whether *πορευθεῖς*, *having gone or departed*, here means *going to heaven*, or *coming from heaven*.

I cannot find that I am pilloried by Bishop Burgess, on this score, in any other case than those already considered in the Notes of this Chapter, with the exception of p. 117, respecting my remarks on Phil. ii. 7, 8 (*Unitarianism &c.*, p. 185), where I state, that the word “ rendered *man*, denotes one who is in the lower walks of life, of common rank, and with common powers.” The Bishop says, “ Dr. Carpenter refers to SCHLEUSNER’s authority for such meaning : but that is not the meaning which Schleusner gives to the passage.” I do not even intimate that it is. In the note, I extract a valuable passage from Mr. Cappe, stating the well-known fact, that in the Jewish language “ there are three “ terms which signify the same general idea, *Man* : one denoting “ it with the connotation of *mortality and misery* ; another with the “ connotation of *meanness and inferiority of rank* ; and a third with “ the connotation of *dignity and honour*.” I add, “ that the N. T. Writers do sometimes employ *σὰρξ*, *ανθρώπος*, and *άνηρ*, with the above-mentioned associated ideas, see Schleusner.” This is *all*. I now add, Schleusner does show what I say he does.

On such grounds, Reader, the Bishop of St. David’s feels himself justified in charging us with the “ ABUSE of authorities :” and on such grounds the Dean of Cork tells his Readers that the Bishop has put Dr. Carpenter in the pillory with Mr. Belsham. It sometimes happens that the prisoner at the bar is acquitted, and the witness made to take his place.

and I shall then pay a suitable attention to Dr. Nares's strictures. But I advert to this part of the Dean's *Postscript*, to notice another misrepresentation, which is exclusively his own. He says that my "criticism and science both coincide with those of Mr. Belsham," in reference to the passages which speak of our Lord's ascending to HEAVEN or descending from it. I will say nothing about my criticism; but by the term *science* the Reader is directed to the Dean's *assertion*, p. 95 [559], reiterated in various forms, that Mr. Belsham, "by his knowledge of astronomy," "pronounces himself entitled to assert, that no such thing as a *local* heaven can possibly exist." Now in the very page (257) to which the Dean refers, I expressly state, that the word *heaven*, among its various significations in the Scriptures, "sometimes denotes a place permanently favoured with peculiar manifestations of the divine presence, the residence of superior and happy intelligences." There is nothing in what I have written, to authorize a doubt, whether I believe in a local heaven. If the Dean believe that I do not, he believes without reason. If he do not so believe, he virtually asserts what he does not believe. Indeed I apprehend that his assertions are often made, without that feeling which I have been accustomed to call deliberate conviction; or, perhaps, without due examination, and through the influence of party spirit, he declares things till he believes them, and then declares them because he believes them.*

* Peter Bohler's advice to John Wesley was, Preach faith till you have it, and then preach it because you have it.

I may not find it necessary to notice any more of the Dean's misrepresentations of my own views and arguments: but the statements of this chapter are, I trust, sufficient to support my claim upon the Reader, that he should not regard me as undeserving of credit, when I quote Schleusner or other authorities, merely because the Dean of Cork and the Bishop of St. David's so represent me;* and that he should suspend his

* I must advert to one other charge made against me by Bishop Burgess. I do not recollect that Dean Magee has repeated it from him, which is rather surprising: but I have observed it urged against me, by various Clergymen and in various publications, as a specimen of "the misrepresentations by which the Unitarians support their system," as an impeachment of my credibility when citing authorities, and even as exposing me to "the heavy charge of handling the word of God deceitfully." Now for the case.

In Dr. Clarke's *Scripture Doctrine*, Part iii. ch. ii. §. 2, (3d ed. 1732,) that eminent Writer gives "the most authentic and ancient accounts we have, of the manner of the Primitive Church directing their public Prayers." He quotes from Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Origen. He then cites "the learned Bishop Bull;" and he quotes a passage from his *Discourse concerning Angels*, in which the Bishop states, that in the Clementine Liturgy "all the Prayers are directed to God, in the Name of his Son Jesus Christ; as they are, God be praised," [this evidently shows, says Dr. Clarke, how the learned Bishop thought it desirable they *should* every where be,] "in Our Liturgy."—"And again," continues Dr. Clarke, "'In the FIRST AND BEST AGES,' (saith the same learned Author) 'the CHURCHES OF CHRIST directed ALL THEIR PRAYERS, ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES, to GOD ONLY, through the alone mediation of Jesus Christ.'—Bull's Answer to a Query of the Bishop of Meaux, p. 295."

In my *Letters to Mr. Veysie*, p. 214, (or *Unitarianism &c.* p. 208,) I quote this passage, as, what I really thought it, an acknowledgment of the truth. Those of my Readers who knew Bishop Bull's name

judgment respecting the attacks made by these learned men upon the Unitarians, since it is evident,

as the standard defender of established Orthodoxy, might wonder, as I did, at his inconsistency: but I had no means of verifying Dr. Clarke's quotation, and (like Bishop Burgess, when he quotes Dean Magee, though on rather better grounds than he has,) I quoted "from an authority which I knew I could safely follow." I obviously gave Clarke as my authority. If he misrepresented, it was not my fault. But let the Reader judge whether he did. The whole sentence, it seems, runs thus (Mr. Veysie's *Defence*, p. 128, or *The Bible*, &c., p. xvi.):

"Whereas [in the first and best ages the Churches of Christ directed all their prayers, according to the Scriptures, to God only, through the alone mediation of Jesus Christ,] the Liturgy of the present Church of Rome is interspersed with supplications and prayers to *angels* and *saints*, the unwarrantableness of which I have above sufficiently shewn."—"The words inclosed in brackets," says Bishop Burgess, "Dr. Carpenter" (he should have said Dr. Clarke) "has taken out of the entire passage, and has thus *completely perverted* the Bishop's sentiments." The good Bishop of St. David's had before said, "A GROSSER MISREPRESENTATION of authority never was employed to mislead the incautious Reader."

To this charge I plead not guilty, with perfect confidence. If I had originally known as much as I now do, I would have given the quotation *in full*; yet, with the whole connection before me, I maintain, that as far as Bishop Bull's authority goes, it is *decisive* as to the exclusive worship of the Father, in the first and best ages of the Christian Church. Bishop Burgess, indeed, tells us (*The Bible*, &c. p. xvii.), that Bishop Bull "says to *God only*, in exception to the worship of *angels* and *saints*. Prayers which are offered to the Father, or to the Son, or to the Holy Spirit, are offered to God only." But Bishop Bull adds, "*through the alone mediation of Jesus Christ*:" and this decides the question. Every one who is in the least acquainted with ecclesiastical history, knows, that in the first and best ages of the Christian Church,

at some, at least, of these attacks, are extremely
sty, and produced by the bewildering darkening
fluence of an intolerant spirit. Instances are not
unting, in which the Dean has misled the Bishop.

this chapter, cases occur, in which the Bishop has
 misled the Dean. For myself, I have made, and I will
like, no quotation, throughout this volume, upon the
thority of another, without express acknowledg-
ent of that authority. Perhaps I shall be able,
ereby, to make less show of reading: but it is not
this purpose that I write; but, to state and defend
system of doctrine which is dear to my heart, be-
use I believe it, solemnly, and upon repeated and
ig-continued examination, to be the truth as it is in
sus.

yers were never addressed to the Holy Spirit; and Bishop Bull
st have known it too. By his very terms, *the Son* is excluded;
prayers could not be addressed to the Son, *through his own me-*
tion. By *God only*, therefore, the learned Bishop must have
ant *the Father*: and his testimony, (which is not the less valu-
e, for being unintentional,) is clear and express, that in the first
d best ages of the Christian Church, their prayers were always
dressed to God, even the Father, *through Christ Jesus*; and that
this they followed the Scriptures. I have no doubt that both
rts of the proposition are perfectly true.

CHAPTER VI.

ON THE DEAN OF CORK'S MISREPRESENTATIONS OF
DR. PRIESTLEY.

I HAVE already said enough, to show the Reader what system Dr. Magee adopts, in order to overturn Unitarianism. Of course Dr. Priestley is one leading object of his attack ; and in this chapter, I shall more particularly consider the mode in which he conducts it. But I must first state, in part, my own views respecting that truly eminent individual : other things will occur as we proceed.

Dr. Priestley's character was marked by an almost childlike simplicity ; and his open frankness and undisguisedness sometimes gave the advantage to those who had more of worldly wisdom. Like that Apostle whom in several respects he resembled, in simplicity and godly sincerity he had his conversation in the world. There was in him neither art nor guile ; and he wrote as though all the world were as guileless and as artless as himself. He said all he thought, and why he thought ; and certainly did not enough consider the use which might be made of his less digested views and arguments, by bitter or prejudiced opponents, or by injudicious admirers.

The success which in various ways attended his pursuits, and the degree in which he must have perceived that he outstripped the great bulk of his

contemporaries, both in moral and in physical science, naturally produced a self-confidence, which sometimes might really be without foundation, and which often would appear so, to those who could not understand the processes of his mind, or appreciate, as they deserved, the excellencies of his character. This self-confidence is most manifested, when the contemptuous sneers, the overbearing arrogance, or the paltry insinuations, of his opponents,—or their brutal efforts to destroy his well-earned reputation, in order to destroy the force of his arguments,—led him to show on what ground he felt that he stood, and firmly to maintain it.

Indefatigable activity marked his life ; but it was of that kind which, having great objects in view, seldom put on the form of minute drudgery. Whether he would ultimately have advanced truth more, by writing more cautiously, some may doubt. My own opinion is that he would. His first thoughts were often happy ; but there was sometimes a boldness in them, which appeared like temerity, and which was only calculated for those who themselves sometimes soared towards the Sun. They afford indeed materials for thinking ; and many they have set to think : but he sometimes relinquished them himself ; and they served to throw an odium on himself and his opinions, which did not belong to either.

His learning was much more solid and extensive than the Academic chooses or perhaps knows how to admit. His time had not been spent on the trifles of literature ; and what was devoted to classical pursuits, enabled him to enter on the field of scriptural investigation with éminent success. Still, it must be

134 EXAMINATION OF DR. MAGEE'S STATEMENTS.

admitted that minute verbal criticism was not his forte; and it must also be remembered, that less was known in his days than at present, of the principles and facts which respect the integrity of the sacred text.*

* In the *Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 127, Dr. Priestley says that the Syriac Version of the O. T. "is confessed to be of little authority." This assertion was probably founded on Leusden's opinion respecting it (see *Horne's Introduction*, vol. i. p. 286); but it is in direct opposition to that of the most competent judges; and it meets, as might be expected, with severe animadversion from Dr. Magee. If the Dean's strictures had often been as well founded, I should never have attempted to reply.

The Essay in which this statement is made, was written at an early period of Dr. Priestley's theological career; but not before he was well acquainted with the original language of the O. T. How much he had made this his object, may be gathered from a later work, his *Letters to Dr. Horne, &c.* (1787), in which (p. 187) in reply to an assertion of Dr. Parkhurst, that "he appears to have" "but a slender acquaintance with the original language of the" "O. T., and never to have read the Hebrew Bible with care and" "attention," Dr. Priestley enters into particulars as follows.

"I have, in the course of my life, given very particular attention to the Hebrew language. I began the study of it when I was about fifteen, and remember that at about eighteen I read in the historical books of the Old Testament, from Hebrew into English, at family prayers. I taught Hebrew to a friend now living, before I was eighteen. Before I was twenty, I had read the Hebrew Bible twice through, once with points, and once without points. I had, likewise, read other books in Hebrew besides the Bible, and had begun the study of other oriental languages. I was then pretty well acquainted with Syriac, and was able to read Arabic. After this, though my attention was drawn to other objects, I never wholly laid aside my application to Hebrew; and it has happened that, within less than sixteen months of the last year, I read the Hebrew Bible quite through, chiefly in Kennicott's edition,

His attachment to Christianity, and indeed to Revelation in general, was earnest and cordial. It influenced all his theological and moral writings. The principles of his venerated Lord guided his life in ordinary circumstances, as well as in great and trying exigencies. And as his faith was not a mere speculative principle, it purified, and elevated, and expanded, and warmed, his heart. It made him love God, and it made him love his brother also. It preserved him constantly in the path of Christian sobriety. It kept out every feeling of envy and jealousy, and every unjust and malignant disposition. In short, it made his life a practical comment on the great maxim of the Apostle, **NO MAN LIVETH TO HIMSELF.**

The grand views which he entertained of the divine character and dispensations, gave a dignity to all his religious conduct, and made devotion the habit of his life. Those who cannot appreciate the piety of the heart, unless it is expressed in the language of modern Orthodoxy, will not believe this: but those who have formed their devotional taste and style on the language of Scripture, and especially on the Christian's

(led to it in some measure, by a present being made me of that noble work by a person unknown, and for which I take this opportunity of returning thanks for it,) and this I did without considering it as any great addition to my other business. If after all this, I know so very little of Hebrew as you represent, there must be something very extraordinary in the case; and the story will yield but little encouragement to other persons to apply to it.

“ But really, Sir, the important question is not, whether Dr. Horsley or myself know more of Greek, whether you or I know more of Hebrew, but which of us makes the best use of what we do know.”

model, will perceive that the devotion of Priestley was genuine; and that in the offering of stated prayer, as well as in the devotion of his life, he worshipped God in spirit and in truth.

As a lover of truth, were I obliged to select one as my guide and master in the pursuit of it; it should be Dr. Priestley, far before his accuser. Under the guidance of the former, I should feel a confidence that no arts of concealment or misrepresentation would be employed; no false terrors excited; no misquotations made to serve a purpose: that controversial feelings, if they sometimes misled, would not blind, his judgment; that if he led me wrong, as soon as he discovered it himself, he would retrace his steps and set me right; and that there were no worldly motives to warp his opinions, and make him wish that to be truth which he believed to be so.

In the writings of Priestley, we constantly see the characters of an ingenuous fearless lover of the truth: in those of the Dean of Cork, the impression continually forced upon the mind is, that he writes for victory and its rewards. The latter cannot brook opposition from any one; and he does what he can to bear it down. He writes as one who is not only confident that he is in the right, but that every one who differs from him must be in the wrong. Yet truth, if he have it, appears to have come to him without, in the first instance, his searching for it; but a divergency from his standard is always referred to obliquity of affection or the pride of understanding.*

* "Wherever there are found to prevail (says the Dean of Cork)

I doubt not that among those whose doctrines the Unitarian opposes, there are those who love truth as well, and pursue it as faithfully, as Dr. Priestley: but I cannot reckon the Dean of Cork among them. Did I believe with him, I should grieve that Truth had for her advocate, one who so unworthily defended her.

“ a vain confidence in the sufficiency of human reason, and a consequent impatience of authority and controul, with a desire to reject received opinions, and to fritter away, by subtle distinctions, plain and established PRECEPTS, there the soil is already prepared for its reception,” viz. of Unitarianism, “ and the seed is already sown.” *Discourses and Dissertations*, vol. i. p. 150.

I understand the assertion of the Dean to amount to this, that whenever a person begins to think for himself, and to refuse the “ prostration of his understanding ” to human authority, he is in the high road to Unitarianism: and I think so too. As to the word *precepts*, in the above quotation, I presume that we must not attempt to ascertain its import. It is generally admitted that Unitarians lay peculiar stress upon the precepts of Christianity. Here, probably, as in many other places, the Dean did not address the understanding, but the imagination, of his Readers.

SECTION I.

The Dean's Misrepresentations of Dr. Priestley, in his Dissertation on the Prevalence of Human Sacrifices.

The Dean of Cork's system is, to show that, in some points, Dr. Priestley was mistaken; and that therefore his statements are never to be credited: that his arguments are sometimes fallacious; and therefore are never entitled to attention. If the Dean may be trusted, Dr. Priestley cannot.

"I have dwelt much too long upon this point; but it is of importance that it should be well understood, what reliance is to be placed on the *knowledge*, and what credit can be given to the *assertions*, of a writer, whose theological opinions have obtained no small degree of circulation in the sister-island, and whose confident assumption of superiority, and loud complaints against the alleged backwardness of divines of the Established Church in biblical investigation, might draw the unwary reader into an implicit admission of his gratuitous positions." Vol. i. p. 234.

His grand attack for this purpose, in which he considers himself completely triumphant, respects Dr. Priestley's statements in the *Theological Repository* (vol. i. p. 400—430), designed to show that *the death of Christ was no proper SATISFACTION for sin*. The selection of this article, for the purpose of critical dissection, I maintain to be unjust on two grounds. The first is, that from the very nature of the work for which it was designed, as well as from the date of

it, it must be considered as containing the Author's early thoughts:* and in the next place, his more digested and regular arguments on the subject were before the public.

But I leave this ground, and proceed to show, that Dr. Magee is guilty of glaring misrepresentations of the article in question ; and that no one can form, from what he says of it, any just idea of its real

* The peculiar object of the *Theological Repository* was, to serve as a channel of free communication among thinking men, "of all new observations that relate to theology." It was intended to lead them to embody "new thoughts, improvements, and hints;" upon the principle, that the ideas which occur to intelligent men, even if they eventually prove to be themselves erroneous, may lead, by discussion and investigation, to views which would otherwise have been unperceived. "Into these repositories," says Dr. Priestley, in the Introduction, (speaking of such publications generally, but undoubtedly in reference to the particular work in question,) "all persons should be invited and encouraged to throw EVERY NEW THOUGHT that occurs to them, without waiting till it swell into a volume of itself. These repositories, therefore, would at the same time promote the early communication of new thoughts, concentrate as it were valuable knowledge, and prevent useless and tedious publications."

Though there are various Essays in the *Theological Repository*, which have a standard and a permanent value, many others ought, in some parts at least, to be regarded as early and even undigested thoughts: and if the Writer afterwards published his more matured views, these alone should furnish the ground of attack against him.

The Dean of Cork, however, did not mean that his Readers should suppose that he was attacking one of the earliest controversial productions of Dr. Priestley; for in vol. i. p. 475, he says, "Having from LONG experience learnt the value of a confident assertion," &c. Yet the work was published in 1769.

merits. I say this with more confidence, because I was myself, for a long time, misled by the statements of the Dean of Cork. Before I had learnt that it was necessary to examine even his *quotations*, and still more frequently his citations, I did the honoured name of Priestley discredit, by believing what is asserted in the *Dissertations*; and I deeply regretted that he should have said what I was told he had said, when, on reading with my own eyes, I found that his reasonings had been caricatured, and his statements falsified.

Accustomed to the high Calvinistic form of Atonement, Dr. Priestley uses the term continually, as synonymous with what we now, more precisely, term the doctrine of Satisfaction, and even with the higher forms of that doctrine, which represent it as necessary that an infinite, or at least superior being, should, by undergoing suffering and death for us, and mediating for us with the offended Deity, *render him disposed* to pardon our sins, or *enable* him to do so, by making satisfaction to his justice. Against this doctrine, in one or other of its higher forms, Dr. Priestley's arguments are directed; and by his own obvious and avowed use of the term *Atonement*, and not by Dr. Magee's definition, must their relevancy be appreciated. By altogether neglecting the general object of the Author whom he censures, and availing himself of some want of precision in detached expressions, the Dean endeavours to make it appear, that Dr. Priestley was ignorant of facts of which he was not ignorant, and that his inferences from what he knew were utterly unfounded.

In the Fifth Dissertation the Dean brings forward a laboured and very needless proof, that human sacrifices were prevalent throughout the heathen world. Did Dr. Priestley ever deny this? Clearly not. In his *Institutes*,* we find the fact distinctly stated, that “*human sacrifices prevailed all over the heathen world.*” Nay, more, in the very papers which Dr. Magee was opposing (p. 261), the same fact is expressly adverted to; “*When they offered HUMAN victims, it was only under the notion of something exceedingly dear to them, as a proof of their greater affection to their gods and to their religion.*” I think Dr. Priestley decidedly wrong as to the motive he assigns; but that he was ignorant, or wished to keep his Readers in ignorance, of the fact of the prevalence of human sacrifices, is an utterly unwarrantable conclusion.

That the Dean of Cork meant his Readers to understand, that Dr. Priestley denied this fact, or was ignorant of it, is clear from the manner in which he afterwards cites a valuable passage from the Notes on

* *Institutes*, vol i. p. 132, or *Works*, vol. ii. p. 84, where various instances are given. This work was first composed about 1755, when the Author of it was twenty-three years of age. He mentions it in his own Memoirs as follows:

“All the while I was at the Academy, (says Dr. Priestley,) I never lost sight of the great object of my studies, which was the duties of a Christian minister; and there it was that I laid the general plan which I have executed since. Particularly I there composed the first copy of my *Institutes of Natural and Revealed Religion*; Mr. Clark, to whom I communicated my scheme, carefully perusing every section of it, and talking over the subject of it with me.” *Memoirs*, vol. i., p. 22.

the Bible, where Dr. Priestley says, " Among *all the heathens*, and especially in the time of Moses, HUMAN SACRIFICES were considered as the most acceptable to the gods." The Dean speaks of the " striking inconsistency " of this, with his positions quoted in the Fifth Dissertation. See vol. ii. p. 15 [i. 503].

Dr. Priestley was not ignorant of this fact, nor did he ever mean to deny it. The prevalence of human sacrifices, gross as the notions are which led to them, presents no obstacle to his general position, which was, not as the Dean represents it (vol i. 124), " *That natural religion impresses no fear of divine displeasure*, and prescribes no satisfaction for offended justice beyond repentance;" but that it teaches no necessity of some mediator to make an equivalent satisfaction to offended justice. And this doctrine the Dean does not himself hold, any more than Dr. Priestley.

Dr. Priestley's principle is, that nature prompts no apprehension that the Deity could not be propitiated, and his anger removed, by means within the power of the *individual* to accomplish ; and that therefore the feelings of nature do not lead to the supposition, that, to propitiate the Deity, to remove his anger, to satisfy his justice, the intervention and sufferings of some superior being is necessary. This is true ; and to this point alone, some of his most unqualified statements refer. That the Deity is inexorable, and that no prayers or sacrifices which men can offer will turn away his anger, and that his justice is a vindictive inflexible principle, which requires an equivalent satisfaction, such as the human being cannot make, are

the notions which he endeavours to show have no foundation in untaught nature; and if Dr. Magee had not been culpably ignorant of the language employed by those whose opinions Dr. Priestley opposes, he must have perceived this.

Altogether neglecting the great principles and arguments contained in the Essay, the Dean, at the end of what he terms an “*enumeration of facts*,” respecting the prevalence of human sacrifices, thus proceeds:

“From this enumeration of facts, it seems not difficult to decide, whether the dictate of untutored reason be, the conviction of **DIVINE BENEVOLENCE**, and the persuasion that the Supreme Being is to be conciliated by good and virtuous conduct *alone*: and from this also we shall be enabled to judge what degree of credit is due to the assertions of those who pronounce that “*all men naturally apprehend the Deity to be propitious*;” that “*no nation whatever, either Jew or Heathen, ancient or modern, appears to have had the least knowledge, or to betray the least sense of their want, of any expedient of satisfaction for sin, besides repentance and a good life* :” and that “from a full review of the religions of all ancient and modern nations, they appear to be *utterly destitute of any thing like a doctrine of proper atonement*.” These assertions Doctor Priestley has not scrupled to make, (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. pp. 401, 411, 416, and 421,) and boldly offers “the range of the whole Jewish and Heathen world” to supply a single fact in contradiction.” *Disc. and Diss.* vol. i. p. 120.

I pass by the less definite misrepresentations which follow, of Dr. Priestley’s reasonings; and confine myself to a few remarks on this passage.

The first thing I observe is, that where Dr. Priestley offers “the range of the whole world, of

Jews and Heathens," it is not in reference to *any one* of the "assertions" which the Dean says he "has not scrupled to make." Dr. Priestley is opposing the opinion, that without "the apprehension of some farther satisfaction being made to divine justice than repentance and reformation," "sincere penitents" would "be subject to perpetual alarms, lest all they could do should be ineffectual to restore them to the divine favour and acceptance." He requires some "clear instances" "of persons being actually distressed with these supposed fears and doubts;" and declares, that "till some can be proved to have expressed their doubts and uncertainty of the divine favour in case of sincere repentance," he "can treat this case as no other than an imaginary one." He continues, "the demand cannot be thought unreasonable: there is the range of the whole world, of Jews and Heathens, before Christ; and if that be too narrow, of three or four centuries in Christianity, to search for such persons." If Dr. Magee had fulfilled his demand, he would have proved Dr. Priestley's boldness to be groundless; but he has done what is easier, misrepresented the nature of it. It is not true, that Dr. Priestley boldly offers the range of the whole world, for the purposes which the Dean says he did. He offers it for one object alone; and that a different one.

The other points suggested by this passage are, in some respects, of minor consequence; but they will show that those who would form a just judgment of Dr. Priestley, must not take their opinions from the Dean of Cork. The Reader will oblige me by

reverting to the first canon stated (p. 118), on the Dean's authority, respecting quotations; and then compare the words given by the Dean as Dr. Priestley's, with Dr. Priestley's own, which are as follows: "I have carefully attended to all the accounts I have met with of the religions of other modern nations, but have found them all equally destitute of any thing like a doctrine of proper atonement" (p. 416). If I am told that Dr. Priestley has said *something like* what Dr. Magee says he has, I will not deny it; but I cannot admit that any writer QUOTING the words of the author he opposes, shall ALTER *the words*, so as to give them *the complexion which best suits his purpose*. Should the Unitarians so quote Dr. Magee, let his censures light heavily upon them; as it is, they fall on his own head.

But even for what Dr. Priestley *did* say, he does not make the bold offer attributed to him by the Dean. This I have already shown. The Dean therefore gives as Dr. Priestley's words, words which are not his; and asserts that he offers as proof of them, what he does not so offer. Yet it is this Writer who charges the Unitarians with *selecting* and *rejecting* "from any sentence which they profess to quote, just what they find convenient." May we not justly use his own words (vol. i. 124), in reference to himself, "It seems not difficult to determine how far he relies upon the ignorance of his readers,* and upon the

* Dr. Magee means, by *ignorance*, deficiency in knowledge on subjects of common information. I use the term in reference to the supposed deficiency of his Readers, in knowledge respecting the

Dr. Priestley then makes some remarks respecting the nature of men, as reasonable and moral agents; and afterwards continues as follows :

“ Now all that we conceive could possibly be done for us, —all that even infinite wisdom, goodness, and power could contrive and execute in order to our recovery, due regard being had to our nature, may be reduced to these following particulars. *First*, To instruct us in the whole extent of our duty. *Secondly*, To engage us to the performance of it, by the promise of suitable and sufficient rewards, and to deter us from disobedience by the fear of punishment. *Thirdly*, To draw us by a proper set of examples of virtue; and *lastly*, To give us the most satisfactory assurance of the pardon of our past sins upon our repentance and reformation, of the certain acceptance of our sincere though imperfect endeavours to do our duty, and of all necessary assistance in the practice of it.

“ And hath not all this been done for us in the most ample manner, in a course of moral dispensations, commencing in the days of our first progenitor, and carried on with the utmost regularity, through the hands of the *Patriarchs*, *Moses*, and the *Prophets*; till it received its highest perfection by the hands of the blessed Son of God himself; who, on this truly great and generous errand, submitted to all the infirmities, indignities, and inconveniencies of human life; and, to close the whole, in the most advantageous manner, died a most painful and ignominious death?

“ Is not here a scheme of salvation and redemption, in every part complete, without any atonement? Simple as it is, do not the few parts of which it consists, contain every thing that could be applied, with effect, for our benefit? Would not, then, any addition to it greatly clog and embarrass the scheme, and spoil its effect? You say, this leaves us at a loss to know what provision is made for the pardon of our sins: but what doth that concern us? If we have the

fullest assurance, from the mouth of God himself, that our sins are *actually* forgiven, upon our repentance (though we did not know for what reason, or whether any other reason than repentance were necessary,) should not that satisfy us? Is not this assurance, all that can possibly be any inducement to us to forsake our evil ways, and return to God and our duty?

“ You still ask, what necessity for the death of Christ upon this scheme? If he did not die to make satisfaction for our sins, must he not have died for some end that was very low, and unworthy of him? I reply (by recapitulating what has been advanced before), is to die a martyr to the truth, to prove his divine mission in the most illustrious manner that we can conceive; to ascertain the reality of a resurrection, and a future life, to such beings as we ourselves are; to evidence the benevolence of his heart, and the greatness of his soul, the vast importance of the work he undertook, and how much his heart was in it; to encourage all who should hereafter embrace his religion, to lay down their lives with courage and cheerfulness, in the cause of truth and integrity, by giving an example of suffering virtue in his own agony and death; and that God, by his exaltation to glory, in reward of his obedience unto death, might thereby exhibit, before all who believe in him, an example of the certainty and greatness of the rewards which he will confer on all who shall, in like manner, obey him; were these and the other subordinate ends mentioned in the former part of this article, I say, low and unworthy of Christ? And when we say that he died for these purposes, though we add no other, do we say that he died in vain? When his death, so circumstanced, looked with so friendly an aspect upon human virtue and happiness; and when by this means, our Lord put the finishing hand to so extensive a scheme, in which was done whatever was practicable, to recover fallen man to immortal virtue and happiness; is he not with great propriety styled, our *redeemer, saviour, and mediator*?

“ And when, in the word of God, we are taught to consider all the evils that infest this present world ; the laborious cultivation of the earth ; the shortness and infirmities of human life, with death, and all the evils we can name, as the consequence of the introduction of sin into the world ; when the Almighty threatens impenitent sinners with unspeakable torments in the world to come ; when he hath put in execution a scheme so astonishingly glorious and expensive, to redeem us from all iniquity ; having given up his only begotten son to die, in order to effect it ; can we have any pretence for saying, that God hath not sufficiently testified his abhorrence of sin ? What could he have done more, consistent with his perfections, and with the natures he had given us, to testify that abhorrence ? ” *Theological Repository*, vol. i. p. 423—426.

I leave this passage to the reflections of the Reader, with the full confidence that he must perceive, (1) 'That Dr. Priestley was as ready as himself, to rely on what he saw reason to believe came from God: (2) That there is no pretence whatever, for those ungenerous insinuations, through which Dr. Magee aims to stigmatize him as an unbeliever: and (3) 'That Dr. Priestley's views of Christianity afford the noblest encouragement to the penitent sinner, viz. the *most satisfactory ASSURANCE from the Father of his creatures*, of the pardon of our past sins upon repentance and reformation. He who believes that we possess such an assurance, need not distress himself with human hypotheses respecting the divine justice.

The Dean of Cork never intended that his Readers should form their opinions of Dr. Priestley from his own writings.

SECTION II.

Concerning the System attacked by Dr. Priestley, in the Theological Repository, under the appellation of the "Commonly Received Doctrine of Atonement."

Those who have been led by the Dean of Cork's Third Dissertation, *On the Importance of the Doctrine of Redemption*, to believe that Dr. Priestley denied this doctrine, must have felt some surprise at the quotation which I made near the close of the preceding section. He may think that it does not go far enough ; but surely he can no longer imagine that Dr. Priestley rejected the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.

The Dean accuses Dr. Priestley with giving " an extreme and exaggerated statement " of the " principle of atonement," and then arguing against it. " It is an artifice," he adds, " not confined to Dr. Priestley, to propound the doctrine in those rigorous and overcharged terms; and at the same time to combat it in its more moderate and qualified acceptation: thus insensibly transferring to the latter, the sentiment of repugnance excited by the former." Vol. i. p. 476.

In this and other places, as will hereafter appear, the Dean manifests his ignorance of the state of the controversy at the time when Dr. Priestley wrote; and even of the opinions of a large class of the

religious world at present. The "moderate and qualified acceptation" which the Dean himself maintains, is not the Orthodox one; and it altogether gives up the essential features of that which Dr. Priestley opposes. If the Evangelical party are right, the Dean is almost as heretical as the Unitarians.

I do certainly disapprove of the too definite use which Dr. Priestley makes of the term *Atonement*, in reference to one form of the doctrine. It was to be found, among the more liberal and intelligent part of the Orthodox world, especially in the Church of England and among the Presbyterian Dissenters, in a less obnoxious form. Those who held it, however, seldom gave any distinct idea of their opinions: perhaps they did not themselves appreciate the full extent of the terms which they employed. And while, in words, they often appeared to agree with those who held the higher views of Atonement, in reality, like Dean Magee, they lowered it to such a degree, that though they left nothing definite on which the understanding could rest, it ceased to possess its most obnoxious and unscriptural characters.

This class might, I think, without injustice, complain, that by using the general term Atonement for the highest form of the doctrine, Dr. Priestley did, in fact, (but not through "artifice," for he was incapable of it,) throw a stigma upon those forms of the doctrine with which his arguments had no concern, and against which he did not aim them.

And to this extent, (but to this only,) the censures of the Dean of Cork are not without some foundation. On the other side it is to be observed, that the views

of atonement which Dr. Priestley opposed, were universally prevalent among those whose writings and instructions had been his early guides; that though since the period when he brought forward his strong statements and strong arguments, and probably in no small degree through the influence of them, the doctrine of Satisfaction has by numbers been abandoned, yet it is still the Orthodox doctrine; and, what is of the utmost moment, in defence of Dr. Priestley, *he has so distinctly and repeatedly stated what doctrine he opposes under the more general term, as to leave no room for doubt as to his meaning.*

Still I admit, (for I have nothing to do with the defence of Dr. Priestley, except I feel that I am defending truth at the same time,) that he should have expressly excepted from his strictures, those milder forms of the doctrine of Atonement, with which, in reality, they had nothing to do. But when the Dean proceeds to charge the open-minded and ingenuous Priestley, with “*artifice*,”—with “*managing*” “the authority of the Jewish writers” “so as to draw from them a testimony apparently in his favour,”—with making assertions “*to darken and discard a part of holy writ*,”—with *making use of a sound “to save appearances,”*—* he shows his inability to appreciate the excellencies of such a character. And when he supports such assertions, by false citations, garbled quotations, and misrepresentations, he proves that he instructs the young in “the arts of controversy” by setting the example of them himself. That he does so, I now proceed to show.

* *Disc and Diss.* vol. i. p. 476, 263, 273, 222, 215.

The grand misrepresentation of Dr. Priestley's arguments, and which runs through the whole, consists in making him oppose that which he does not oppose; and thereby appearing to show his assertions to be constantly strained and commonly groundless, and his positions utterly fallacious.

Dr. Priestley attacks what he calls, (as it was when he wrote, and, though less generally, is still,) the **COMMONLY RECEIVED doctrine of Atonement**. If he had given us no clue to his meaning, my defence of him might be as groundless as Dr. Magee's attack: but he does so, not once, but continually: he does so in the very title of that portion of his Essay which is the butt of the Dean's most penetrating arrows,—“The Death of Christ no *Satisfaction* for Sin.”

The series of papers signed *Clemens*, in the first volume of the *Theological Repository*, is entitled, in the Table of Contents, “An Essay on the one great end of the Life and Death of Christ, intended, more especially, to refute the commonly received Doctrine of Atonement.” His first paper chiefly respects what the Author represents (p. 37) as “the one principal and distinguished object of Christianity, which was *to ascertain and exemplify the important doctrine of a future state* ;” but at the close of it he points out (p. 37-43) various “other real objects and ends,” all of which, he says, “either flow from, or are perfectly consistent with, this principal end.” The seventh of them (p. 41) is thus stated:

“One of the rewards of Christ's sufferings being that he should be the means or the instrument by which the doctrines of true religion, (and consequently, as the *most important of*

them, that of the *efficacy of repentance to obtain the remission of sins*,) should be preached to all the world, as well as that he should be the judge of all mankind; and as, in consequence of this, faith in Christ was closely connected with repentance for sin, and a life of virtue, it is with sufficient propriety that the forgiveness of sins is sometimes represented in the New Testament as dispensed to mankind through him."

Dr. Priestley then proceeds to lay down his plan; and proposes (p. 44) to bring various arguments, to prove "that the pardon of sin is not, according to the Christian scheme, dispensed with any *particular regard* to the death or sufferings of Christ; as if they were, in the sense of divines, the **PROCURING CAUSE** of that blessing, and were **NECESSARY in order to remove some IMPEDIMENT** to the natural and essential placability of the divine nature." This is one of the mildest forms of the doctrine of Satisfaction; but it is far beyond what Dr. Magee himself holds, which he sets up as the "received doctrine of Atonement," and by their relevancy to which he appreciates Dr. Priestley's positions and reasonings.

The next two papers have in view, to illustrate the principal figurative representations which are made of the death of Christ; and in both of them, the views which he opposes are *repeatedly and distinctly* stated. This is most expressly done in p. 124; and I will quote the whole passage at length. Having shown the sources of the figurative language of the New Testament respecting the death of Christ, and stated what he considers as the real causes of its being represented as a sacrifice in particular, he continues:

“ Yet, upon this single circumstance has been erected a system of principles, which is, in the most essential points, the reverse of the plain Christian doctrine of salvation by Jesus Christ. Hence hath arisen the notion of the sacrifices prescribed in the Jewish law being appointed by the Divine Being for types of this great, complete, and expiatory sacrifice of the death of Christ, which now supersedes and abrogates them. Hence has the ever blessed God come to be considered as not naturally propitious to his offending creatures, and refusing his mercy to penitent offenders, till his justice was satisfied with the death of his innocent Son; who is supposed to have sustained the utmost effects of the wrath of God, in the place of men, that by sin had exposed themselves to it. Hence too is argued the necessity of Christ being God, equal to his Father, in order to his being able to make atonement for the infinite evil there is supposed to be in the smallest offence as committed against an infinite being. And hence the rest of a system, which, however qualified, has long been a disgrace to Christianity, and a load upon it, which it must either throw off, or sink under. For, encumbered with these truly shocking absurdities, how can it approve itself to the reason of mankind, and make its way through the world of Jews, Mahommedans, and Heathens. It is with a view to do the little that I may be able towards freeing my religion from this incumbrance, (and I think I cannot do it a greater service, or write to a better purpose,) that I have undertaken the consideration of this subject, and on this account I shall discuss every thing belonging to it more fully than it would otherwise deserve.” *Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 124.

It is against such opinions that Dr. Priestley argues; and whether or not he were right in employing the term *Atonement*, yet I am sure it can be defended on no principle of equity, to represent him as arguing against a doctrine which is essentially different from that to which he gives the appellation.

In the commencement of the fourth paper (p. 247), Dr. Priestley says, “ It has been long taken for granted, by the generality of Christians, that the pardon of sin is dispensed in consideration of the sufferings, or, at least, of the merit of Christ; that, notwithstanding the goodness and mercy of the Divine Being, he could not pardon offenders without some satisfaction being previously made to his justice; or, at least, without the intercession, mediation, or some kind of intervention of a person who was not a sinner; and consequently, that something more than repentance and a good life was necessary to reinstate sinners in the divine favour.” And he lays it down as the object of what remains of his Essay, “ to prove, that according to the Christian scheme, the pardon of sin is not dispensed on account of the sufferings and merit of Christ, as if they were, in the sense of divines, the *sine qua non*, or the NECESSARY *procuring cause* of that blessing, and were INDISPENSABLE, in order to remove some impediment to the exertion of the natural and essential placability of the divine nature.”

In the process of the argument, Dr. Priestley repeatedly refers (p. 350) to the notion of a “ full satisfaction ” having been made to the “ offended justice ” of God; of an “ equivalent satisfaction; ” and of the inability of God (p. 263) to pardon, “ without an adequate satisfaction being made to his justice and the honour of his laws and government; ” and (p. 264) to the opinion “ that unless Christ had died as a propitiation for our sins, the Divine Being COULD NOT, *in strict justice*, have received even

penitent offenders into his favour." In p. 327, &c. he argues, that if "the great end of Christ's coming into the world was, that, by a voluntary death, he might make *satisfaction to the justice of God* for the sins, either of the whole world, or those of the elect only, we might expect to find sufficient reference to it in the history and discourses of Christ." "When his death was foretold, it ought to have been as a *satisfaction to divine justice*. Repentance and good works should have been represented as of no effect, and the exertion of divine mercy impeded, *without THIS previous atonement*. Also no other fair opportunity would have been omitted, in which this most important of all doctrines could have been introduced." Here it is obvious that Dr. Priestley uses the term *atonement* as equivalent with *satisfaction*; and he continually does so, especially when speaking of the "commonly received doctrine" of Atonement. This fact must be perfectly clear to every one who peruses, with common care, even the last two papers of the series. The *atonement* supposed to be made by the death of Christ, is, in numerous instances, spoken of as the *satisfaction to divine justice*; and with a vagueness which must seek its apology in the prevalent want of precision on this subject, at the time he wrote, he sometimes uses the terms *propitiation* and *expiation* with nearly the same force.

I have surely given abundant proof of the indisputable fact, that throughout this Essay, Dr. Priestley is attacking the doctrine, that the death of Christ was a *SATISFACTION to the justice of God*, and the *PROCURING CAUSE of divine mercy*, inasmuch as it was

necessary to remove some obstruction which antecedently existed to the exercise of it.

Now the injustice of the Dean of Cork, and it is great, consists in this, that knowing, as he could not but know, the facts which I have stated, and himself attaching to the term *atonement* a notion so little in opposition to Unitarianism, that a Unitarian may embrace it (as far as it is intelligible) without relinquishing his great fundamental principle,—he represents Dr. Priestley as arguing against this notion, against which he never does argue, and appreciates the value of all his arguments and positions by this standard of his own setting up.

If I were to represent the Dean of Cork as arguing in favour of the high satisfaction form of the Atonement, though I know that he not only does not argue in favour of it, but uses the term *atonement* in a sense which in fact has no relation to it,—and, were I to examine his arguments and positions, not by his own explanations, but by my interpretations of his words,—I should be guilty of the same kind of injustice of which the Dean of Cork is now guilty: but not so great in degree; because, from the vagueness and diffuseness with which he writes, it is extremely difficult to gain a clear idea what doctrine precisely he holds; while, on the other hand, the repeated and perspicuous statements of Dr. Priestley as to what he opposes, as the *commonly received* doctrine of Atonement, prevent the possibility of error, if these exist, in union, common discrimination and common desire to know the truth.

This misrepresentation I have thought it necessary to consider somewhat at large, because it is of vital consequence, and of extensive application : in fact, it affects almost every argument on the subject, advanced by the Dean against this great defender of Unitarianism. But I must give some specific instances of his mode of employing it.

In the third Dissertation, " On the Importance of the Doctrine of Redemption," Dr. Magee deservedly speaks of the Redemption by (or rather *through*) Christ Jesus, as the very corner-stone of our Christian faith. I go farther, and say it is the fabric itself: for the final cause of the work and sufferings of Christ, of all that God wrought in and by him, was, (I cannot doubt it, nor can any one who lets the Scripture teach him,) ' that he might redeem us from all iniquity.' Against this doctrine, because thus important, the Dean maintains (p. 90) that " every " framer of a new hypothesis directs his entire force: " this once shaken, the whole structure falls in " ruin." What *new hypothesis* he refers to, it might not be easy to say without further explanation ; but this we derive from the next sentence. " We there- " fore find the collective force of heterodox ingenuity " summoned to combat *this* momentous doctrine " (the doctrine of Redemption) " in a work published " some years back, entitled the Theological Re- " pository."

This is rather a bold assertion, after having studied, as he must have done to find out its faults, such a passage as that quoted in p. 148. Dr. Magee might with equal justice have said, that the object of the

work was to overturn the truth of Christianity itself. The Dean does not intimate that it was the doctrine of *Satisfaction*, (at that time, and even still, the *commonly received doctrine of Atonement*,) which the principal marshaller of this controversial host had in view, and not the doctrine of Redemption through Christ. On the contrary, (after identifying, without explaining it, the “RECEIVED doctrine of Atonement,” with the Christian doctrine of “Redemption by Christ,”) he declares, that Dr. Priestley pronounces *this doctrine*,” (which, by the whole tenor of the antecedents, and the distinctly stated subject of the Dissertation, must mean the doctrine of Redemption by Christ,) “to be ‘one of the *radical*, ‘as well as most generally prevailing corruptions ‘of the Christian scheme:’” * in which assertion, for the reasons already stated, I hesitate not to declare the Dean guilty of gross misrepresentation. But this is only one part of it. He goes on and says, “and in p. 124, he calls it,” still the doctrine of Redemption by Christ, “‘a disgrace to Christianity, and a load upon it, which it must either ‘throw off or sink under:’” and yet Dr. Priestley is *expressly* speaking of the high notions of Satisfaction, &c., as the Reader may convince himself by turning back to p. 156, where this passage is quoted.

* *Theological Repository*, vol. i. p. 429. Dr. Priestley, having abundantly explained in what way he uses the expression, here speaks of the “COMMONLY received doctrine of Atonement.” The Dean frequently speaks of the “RECEIVED doctrine.” I am satisfied that if he knew enough of the opinions of the religious world, he could not truly call his own the *commonly* received doctrine.

Here, then, are two passages brought out of their respective connection, to support a gross charge, which is, of itself, enough to rouse all the best feelings of the Christian, against Dr. Priestley and his opinions; and he is made to speak language which he would have abhorred quite as seriously as the Dean himself.

But, as if this were not enough, in the remaining part of this short Dissertation, the Dean, by skilful curtailments, has prevented the truth from coming out, that Dr. Priestley is in no way opposing the doctrine of Redemption through Christ, but that form of the doctrine of Atonement,—which, whether correctly or not, he terms the *commonly received*, and here the *modern*, doctrine of Atonement, and which Dr. Magee, if he have distinctly defined his system to himself, holds no more than Dr. Priestley did. But I must quote the passage at length. It follows the last expression quoted above.

“And lest the combined exertions of the authors of this work might not prove sufficient to overturn this unchristian tenet, he renews his attack upon it with undiminished zeal in his *History of the Corruptions of Christianity*; among which he ranks this as one of the most important, stating (vol. i. p. 152) that “as the doctrine of the Divine Unity was infringed by the introduction of that of the Divinity of Christ, and of the Holy Ghost (as a person distinct from the Father); so the doctrine of the natural placability of the Divine Being, and our ideas of the equity of his government, have been greatly debased by the gradual introduction of the *modern* doctrine of atonement.” (a) And on this account he declares his intention, of showing in a *fuller manner*, than with respect to any other of the corruptions of Christianity, that it is totally unfounded both in reason and Scripture, and an entire

departure from the genuine doctrine of the Gospel. Indeed the avowed defender of the Socinian heresy, *must* have felt it indispensable to the support of his scheme, to set aside this doctrine. Thus (*Hist. of Cor.* vol. i. p. 272) he says, “ it immediately follows from his ” (Socinus’s) “ principles, that Christ being only a man, though ever so innocent, his death *could not* in any proper sense of the word, atone for the sins of other men.” (b) Accordingly, both in his *History of the Corruptions*, and in the *Theological Repository*, he bends his principal force against *this* doctrine of our church. Shall not then so determined a vehemence of attack upon this doctrine in particular, convince us still more of its importance in the Christian scheme; and point out to the friends of Gospel truth, on what ground they are chiefly to stand in its defence ?” *Disc. and Diss.* vol. i. p. 91.

Now, at (a) the Reader is requested to supply Dr. Priestley’s own explanation of the term he there uses, *which forms a CONTINUED SENTENCE* with what the Dean has quoted, and which he has omitted, for an obvious reason, after the words “ MODERN *doctrine of Atonement,*”—“ which ” (continues the Historian of the Corruptions of Christianity,) “ represents the Divine Being as withholding his mercy from the truly penitent, *till a FULL SATISFACTION is made to his justice,* and for that purpose *substituting his own innocent Son in the place of sinful men.*”

Respecting the Dean’s representations of Socinus’s views, I have two things to observe: (1) That in the sentence preceding what the Dean has quoted, Dr. Priestley says, that Socinus “ saw clearly the absurdity of what was advanced by the other Reformers, concerning *satisfaction* being made to the *justice* of God by the death of Christ;” which sufficiently shows,

if proof were wanting, with what force Dr. Priestley here uses the word *atone*, and what he considers as a "proper sense of the word." But (2) the Dean *withholds* * the sentence immediately following his quotation, which would have proved the *falsity* (it is a harsh censure, but it is the exact one) of his representations of Dr. Priestley's efforts "to combat this momentous doctrine,"—"that of our redemption by Jesus Christ." Dr. Priestley's words, which follow at (b) in the preceding extract, are these: "He (Socinus) was, however, *far from abandoning the doctrine of* REDEMPTION, in the *Scripture* sense of the word, i. e. of our deliverance from the *guilt* of sin by his Gospel, as promoting repentance and reformation, and from the *punishment* due to sin by his power of giving eternal life to all who obey him."

* The Dean was not ignorant of the sentence, for he himself quotes it in vol. i. p. 151. He there cites the whole passage to prove that "the creed of the Unitarian differs materially from" that of Socinus. This is certainly not proved by the sentence which I charge him with unjustly withholding in his Fifth Dissertation; for in this, (as the Reader must perceive,) Dr. Priestley speaks of the opinion of Socinus in terms of approbation. After it, however, he adds, "But, indeed, if God himself freely forgives the sins of men upon their repentance, there could be no occasion, properly speaking, for any thing farther being done to avert the punishment with which they had been threatened." This immediately follows the quotation ending the paragraph in the text; and there is so much unusual obscurity in it, that I cannot much censure the Dean of Cork for the use he has made of it. The *but* marks opposition; but I look upon it as opposition in reference to the notion of the Satisfactionist, not to that of Socinus, which Dr. Priestley had just referred to with approbation.

The sum of the matter is this: the Dean of Cork declares that Dr. Priestley opposes the doctrine of Redemption by Christ, though he held it, and laid great stress upon it, in what he believed to be the scriptural sense of the term; and, what I lay still more stress upon, (since it enables him, in various instances, with the aid of some of the “arts of controversy,” to make Dr. Priestley *appear* a faithless witness and a bungling reasoner,) he altogether neglects Dr. Priestley’s own explication of the term *Atonement*; attaches to it one, in which, as he must know, Dr. Priestley did not use it; and represents him as opposing the doctrine of Atonement in the latter sense, when he knew that his arguments and statements all respected it in the former.

To follow this misrepresentation through all the numerous instances of its application, would carry me far beyond the space I can allow to this part of my work: nor is it necessary. To every one who at all understands the bearings of the subject, this must at once appear a fertile subject of obloquy, affecting not merely the reasoning powers of Dr. Priestley, but his principles of action,—not merely his understanding, but his heart. If Dr. Magee believe that he had simply the support of truth in view, I should think he must begin to perceive, that he falls under the condemnation belonging to those who ‘do evil that good may come.’

I must, however, notice one other instance of the Dean’s system of suppression, connected with the subject of this section, as bearing closely on the great questions of this controversy.

In the *History of Corruptions* (part ii. §. 5), Dr. Priestley treats of the Opinions of the Apostolical Fathers; and he justly observes, that “when any mode of speech may be understood either in a *literal* or in a *figurative* sense, there must be some difficulty in ascertaining the real meaning of the person who makes use of it.” He illustrates this, by the common use of the words, ‘This is my body.’ Catholics and Protestants equally use the expression; “but it does not therefore follow, that they think alike with respect to the Lord’s Supper. For one of them uses the expression as a mere figure of speech, meaning that the bread and wine are representations, or memorials, of the body and blood of Christ; whereas the other takes them to be the body and blood itself, without any figure.”—The next paragraph furnishes the Dean with a pretext for one of his most imposing attacks; and to show how cautious those should be, who engage in this controversy with any regard to equity and even to their own reputation, in following him without examining his grounds, I will place the passage and his representation of its tenor, in parallel columns;—simply premising, that Dr. Priestley’s reasonings respect the opinions of the “*Apostolic Fathers* ;” and that, however capable they may be of full and important application to the *language of Scripture*, it is going rather too far to adduce them, as the Dean does, as a specimen of the way in which, “under the pretence of figure,” “those writers who would reject the doctrine of Atonement, endeavour to evade the force of *texts of Scripture*, the plainest and most positive.” After the observations which

as stated in this paragraph, Dr. Priestley thus argues:

In like manner, it cannot be determined from the words of the five Christians calling the death of Christ a *sacrifice for sin, a ransom, &c.* from their saying, in a plain way, that Christ died in our stead, and that he bore our sins, or even if they carry in this figurative language no farther, that they held what is now called the doctrine of *Atonement*, that it would have been consistent with the maxims of God's moral government to pardon any sinner, unless Christ had made satisfaction to justice for it. Because the language above mentioned may be made use of by persons who only believe the death of Christ was a necessary circumstance in the scheme of the Gospel, that this scheme was necessary to reform the world."

The Dean thus cites this passage: "Thus" (i. e. endeavouring to evade the force of texts of Scripture) "Dr. Priestley (Hist. of Cor. vol. i. p. 214) asserts, that the death of Christ may be called a sacrifice for sin, and a ransom; and also that Christ may in general be said to have died in our stead, and to have borne our sins: and that figurative language, even stronger than this, may be used by persons, who do not consider the death of Christ, as having any immediate relation to the forgiveness of sins, but believe only that it was a necessary circumstance in the scheme of the Gospel, and that this scheme was necessary to reform the world." Disc. and Diss. vol. i. p. 255.

N. B. In these extracts I have retained the punctuation and italics of the Authors.

Such is the Dean's singular mode of citing the sentiments of the Author he opposes. How that which is necessary to accomplish a scheme which was itself necessary to bring mankind into a state in which they could have forgiveness of their sins, can

be said to have no immediate relation to the forgiveness of sins, I leave to the Dean of Cork to determine. Has the regulating spring of a watch no immediate relation to the proper measurement of time, because it does not immediately act upon the index? Upon his own principles, has the *incarnation* of the Son of God no relation to the forgiveness of sins, because it was his *death* which atoned for them?

But what I solicit the Reader particularly to notice is, that when citing such passages, the Dean *carefully avoids* adducing expressions which would at once determine against what doctrine of Atonement Dr. Priestley was directing his arguments, and prove that the system of positions and reasonings, which he has represented as Priestley's, is not the firm erection of that master-builder, but his own paper-house, which it did not require his mighty blast to overthrow in an instant. Here, as elsewhere, and with little variation of statement, we find that Dr. Priestley regarded, as "what is now called the doctrine of Atonement," that which represents the death of Christ as making satisfaction to divine justice for the sins of men, and necessary in order to remove obstructions which would otherwise prevent the exercise of divine mercy. He who does not hold this doctrine, is not affected by, or included in, Dr. Priestley's principal representations and reasonings.

The remainder of the paragraph from which I have extracted the foregoing statement, must also be compared with the passage of Dr. Priestley which affords the ground for the Dean's specious attack upon him.

“That however there are parts of Scripture, which have proved too powerful, *even* for the figurative solutions of the Historian of the Corruptions of Christianity, may be inferred from this remarkable concession. ‘In this then let us acquiesce, not doubting but that, *though not perhaps at present*, we shall in time be able, without any *effort* or *straining*, to explain all particular expressions in the apostolical epistles, &c.’ (*Hist. of Cor.* vol. i. p. 279.) Here is a plain confession on the part of Dr. Priestley, that those enlightened theories, in which he and his followers exult so highly, are wrought out of Scripture only by *effort* and *straining*: and that all the powers of this polemic Procrustes, have been exerted to adjust the apostolic stature to certain pre-ordained dimensions, and in some cases exerted in vain.” *Disc. and Diss.* vol. i. p. 255.

The partial quotation with which the Dean presents his Readers, is just enough for his purpose. On this he founds his assertion, that in the “plain confession of Dr. Priestley,” his theories “are wrought out of Scripture only by effort and straining.” If instead of the &c. at the end of his quotation, he had added the two or three lines more *which complete the sentence*,—and if, at the commencement, he had told his Readers what Dr. Priestley meant when he said, “*In this, then*, let us acquiesce,”—they would have seen that his misrepresentation is absolutely groundless, and that the foundation on which the Historian rests his “theories,” is on *the whole tenor of Scripture* and *the dictates of reason*. The passage is an important one, and I must quote it at length.

“It is now, certainly, time to lay less stress on the interpretation of particular texts, and to allow more weight to general considerations, derived from the whole tenor of scripture, and the dictates of reason; and if there should be found any difficulty in accommodating the one to the other

(and I think there is even less of this than might have been expected), the former, and not the latter, should remain unaccounted for. Time may clear up obscurities in particular texts, by discovering various readings, by the clearer knowledge of ancient customs and opinions, &c. But arguments drawn from such considerations as those of the moral government of God, the nature of things, and the general plan of revelation, will not be put off to a future time. The whole compass and force of them is within our present reach, and if the mind be unbiassed, they must, I think, determine our assent.

“It is certainly a great satisfaction to entertain such an idea of the author of the universe, and of his moral government, as is consonant to the dictates of reason and the tenor of revelation in general, and also to leave as little obscurity in the principles of it as possible, that the articles of our creed on this great subject may be few, clear, and simple. Now it is certainly the doctrine of reason, as well as of the Old Testament, that God is merciful to the penitent, and that nothing is requisite to make men, in all situations, the objects of his favour, but such moral conduct as he has made them capable of. This is a simple and pleasing view of God and his moral government, and the consideration of it cannot but have the best effect on the temper of our minds and conduct in life. The general tenor of the New Testament is likewise plainly agreeable to this view of things, and none of the *facts* recorded in it require to be illustrated by any other principles. In this, then, let us acquiesce, not doubting but that, though perhaps not at present, we shall in time be able, without any effort or straining, to explain all particular expressions in the apostolical epistles, &c. in a manner perfectly consistent with the general strain of their own writings, and the rest of the scriptures.” *Hist. of Cor.* vol. i. p. 263. *Works*, vol. v. p. 154.

It is not, then, the *fact*, that Dr. Priestley confesses that his theories are wrought out of Scripture only by effort and straining. They are founded on its

plain declarations and general tenor, supported by all we know of God from the works of nature, and of the principles of his moral government, as disclosed to us by the usual dealings of his providence. On these he rested them, as an immoveable basis. And, in perfect accordance with the analogies of natural religion and the simplest principles of philosophy, he maintains that we ought to be satisfied with this, and leave the difficulties, if we cannot at present solve them, for farther light and information : not doubting that Revelation will be found, in all its parts, perfectly consistent with itself; and choosing, for our present guidance, that which is plain and unambiguous, which is clearly and expressly taught by the book of nature and providence, as well as by the book of revelation.

He who relinquishes the Newtonian theory of the tides, because he cannot explain by it to all their apparent irregularities,—or he who relinquishes his belief in the divine existence, or at least in the infinity of his goodness, wisdom, and power, because he cannot, agreeably to them, account for the existence of moral evil,—has a right to condemn Dr. Priestley in the course he has taken : but not so the sound philosopher or theist. Whether or not this truly religious philosopher is always right in the application of his principle, the principle itself is required by the soundest maxims of philosophy, and the most important analogies of natural religion.

●

SECTION III.

On Dr. Priestley's Representation of the Sentiments of the Jewish Writers respecting the Doctrine of Atonement.

The statements which I have already made, render it unnecessary to enter into so much detail, respecting the Dean's arguments on the subject of this section, in his Thirty-third Dissertation. They are grounded on the same radical misrepresentation, which furnishes the basis of nearly every thing of moment that he urges against Dr. Priestley.

The Title of the Dissertation is, "On the Sense entertained generally by all, and more especially instanced among the Jews, of the necessity of *Propitiatory Expiation*." It is a singular mode of elucidating a difficult subject, to join words thus loosely together, and to give the Reader no clue to their united import; and such extreme want of precision comes with an ill grace from a Professor, who, to throw ridicule upon one who is vastly his superior in comprehensive reasoning and discriminating perspicuity, and to lower the estimation in which his intellectual character is justly held, has brought forwards, with a needless display of critical acumen, some comparatively unimportant inaccuracies of scientific definition.*

* The Reader of the *Discourses and Dissertations* need not be informed, that I allude to the Dean's attack on Mr. Belsham's *Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind*.

At the commencement of this Dissertation, the Dean defines *expiatory*, in reference to sacrifice, to denote that “ in which, BY the suffering and death of
 “ the victim, the displeasure of God was averted
 “ from the person for whom it was offered, and the
 “ punishment due to his sins remitted, whether the
 “ suffering of the victim was supposed to be strictly
 “ of a *vicarious* nature or not.”* From an expression in vol. i. p. 33, it appears, that *propitiatory* denotes that which is designed to “ avert the displeasure of God.” In like manner, in p. 330, the Dean represents *propitiation* as implying the removal of the divine displeasure, and the restoration of the offender to the divine favour. And still more expressly, in reference to the Jewish sacrifices, he represents it (p. 378) as equivalent to calling them *propitiatory*, to say, that “ in consequence of the
 “ sacrifice of the animal, and in virtue of it, either

* *Propitiation* seems peculiarly to respect the effect on the mind of the person offended: *Expiation*, the removal of the stain upon the purity, honour, or innocence, of the individual. Of this distinction, however, even if well founded, the Dean cannot avail himself; nor would it be of much service, in this connection, to justify *propitiatory* *expiation*.

In vol. i. p. 306, Dr. Magee gives an implied explanation of *expiation*, from Cudworth, as denoting *the appointed means of preservation*. That learned reasoner gives too loose an application to the term; but suppose it allowable, who would hesitate in calling the death of Christ an *expiation*, in the most extensive and important sense? Indeed, in the definition in the text, if for BY, the Dean had said THROUGH, the suffering and death, &c., I should cheerfully have admitted that, in this sense also, the death of Christ was *expiatory*.

“ immediately or remotely; the pardon of the offender “ was procured.” How these definitions bear upon the great question as to the ends of the death of Christ, may hereafter appear : it is sufficient, at present, to observe that, upon the Dean of Cork’s own definitions, there could be no *expiation* which was not also *propitiatory*; and that, consequently, to speak of a PROPITIATORY EXPIATION is as great a violation of precision, as to say a FOUR-SIDED SQUARE.

It is more important, however, to observe, (in proceeding in my defence of one whose intellectual and moral character I have learnt to appreciate even more highly than before, from the examination to which Dr. Magee has led me,) that, having laid down the above definition of *expiatory*, he represents (p. 258) Dr. Priestley as asserting, “ that the Heathens had no idea whatever of such sacrifice;” and he then goes on as follows :

“ He employs one entire essay in the *Theological Repository* (vol. i. p. 400, &c.), in the proof, that in no nation, ancient or modern, has any such an idea ever existed : and, as we have seen already in No. V., pronounces it to be the unquestionable result of an historical examination of the subject, that *all*, whether Jews or Heathens, ancient or modern, learned or unlearned, have been ‘ equally strangers to the notion of expiatory sacrifice ; equally destitute of *any thing like a doctrine of proper atonement.*’ ” *Disc. and Diss.* vol. i. p. 258.

Now, as the age of pious frauds is over, no one would suppose that a learned Dignitary of the Established Church, who had held one of the highest stations among the Instructors of youth, and who was writing to warn them against falling into theological

error, and to teach them to shun the “arts of controversy,” would *fabricate* words for Dr. Priestley. It is surely sufficient, to do what I have repeatedly shown that the Dean has done, viz. to cite him unfairly, by taking words out of their connection, or omitting part of a sentence, or to give his sentiments a different complexion, by expressing them in different words: but that he should *quote* as Dr. Priestley’s words, what Dr. Priestley does not say, one would have supposed impossible: and, therefore, numbers have, of course, believed, on the evidence of the Dean of Cork, that Dr. Priestley has said what the Dean here says he has. I believed it myself, till I began to find that no dependence was to be placed on Dr. Magee’s statements respecting his opponents; and laid it down as a rule, not to judge unfavourably of the arguments and positions of any one, merely on his authority.

Well might he call the supposed words of Priestley, a “gross contradiction to all the records of antiquity;” and say that they are irreconcilable even with his own positions. But they are not his words. The Dean of Cork is guilty of two “gross” breaches of controversial equity, in this professed quotation. The first is, that the former clause (which gives a peculiar colour to the second,) no where occurs in the Essay, though it is represented, according to the Dean’s own canon, as occurring in immediate continuity with the following clause; and the second is, that by the term “*proper atonement*,” though the Dean virtually represents it as corresponding with “*expiatory sacrifice*,” Dr. Priestley uniformly means,

and has often explicitly stated his meaning, a doctrine far beyond what the Dean understands by the expression. *See above*, p. 163.

But this is not all. After asserting that Dr. Priestley maintains "in this place," (though Dr. Priestley does not maintain it, but Dr. Magee in his stead,) "that neither ancient nor modern Jews ever conceived an idea *of expiatory sacrifice*," he proceeds to declare, that Dr. Priestley "contends in another (p. 426), that this notion," viz. of expiatory sacrifice, "has arisen from the circumstance of the simple religion of Christ having been 'entrusted to *such vessels* as were the Apostles;' for, adds he, 'the Apostles were Jews, and had to do with Jews, and consequently represented Christianity in a Jewish dress,'—and this more particularly 'in the business of sacrifices.'" The passages in single inverted commas, are regularly marked by the Dissertator as quotations; (see above, p. 118). The variations are not very essential in point of import, except that the *first* gives a *different style of expression*, from that of Dr. Priestley, and is obviously intended to make it appear as objectionable as possible:* but they serve to show how loosely the

* Dr. Priestley's words (*immediately* following the passage quoted in p. 150) are, "With this great and simple scheme of religion, the Apostles were intrusted, that they might publish it for the benefit of the world. And when we consider what vessels they were that it was deposited in," (evidently alluding to St. Paul's own words, 'We have this treasure in earthen vessels,') "and to what immediate use it was to be applied," &c. *Theological Repository*, vol. i. p. 426.

Dean *quotes*; and may put some on their guard; how they argue from his professed quotations. After this statement, he comes to the following conclusion from the contradictory sentiments which he charges upon Dr. Priestley:

“Now, if the Jews had *no* notion whatever of expiatory sacrifice, it remains to be accounted for, how the cloathing the Christian doctrine of redemption in a *Jewish* dress, could have led to this notion. It is true, he adds, that over the *Jewish disguise*, which had been thrown on this doctrine by the *Apostles*, another was drawn by Christians. But if the Jewish dress bore *no* relation to a doctrine of atonement, then the Christian disguise is the only one. And thus the Christians have deliberately, without any foundation laid for them, *either by Heathens or Jews*, superinduced the notion of an expiatory sacrifice, on the simple doctrines of the Gospel: converting *figurative language*, into a *literal* exposition of *what was known never to have had a real existence!!!*” [The preceding extract is given with the Dean’s Italics, &c.] *Disc. and Diss.* vol. i. p. 259.

Now this is very great nonsense, certainly; but then it is not Dr. Priestley’s. In the Dean of Cork’s sense of *expiatory sacrifice*, Dr. Priestley no where declares that the Jews had no notion of it whatever. And he no where says, that the Jewish dress in which the Christian doctrine of Redemption is clothed, bore no relation to a doctrine of Atonement. What he maintains is, that figures and allusions, founded upon the ritual atonements of the Law, having been employed by the Apostles and primitive Fathers, to express the Christian “scheme of salvation and redemption” (see above, p. 148), though these figurative expressions have no real relation whatever to

the "COMMONLY RECEIVED doctrine of Atonement," yet, through the "well-meant labours of many Christian divines, for some centuries past," "we have not only adopted them all, but have put very forced and unnatural constructions upon the figures themselves." (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 428.)—For my own satisfaction, I have examined many statements given by the Dean, of the arguments of those whom he opposes; and I have seldom left the employment, without having the feeling of disgust forced upon me, at the imposing system of artful and refined misrepresentation which they exhibit. In the above instance, (which is but one among numbers,) the Dean, by false citations, or false interpretations, makes the Unitarian

* From an invaluable, and in my estimation truly *Evangelical* Discourse, which has recently reached us from America, and to which I shall have occasion hereafter to call the attention of my Readers more particularly, it appears that, on the other side of the Atlantic, the "*prevalent system*" of Atonement corresponds with what Dr. Priestley called the "*commonly received doctrine*;" and that Dr. Magee would not there be strictly *orthodox*, any more than in England. It appears, too, that "many" of the Unitarians in America go nearly as far as the Dean of Cork himself; which confirms what I have heretofore said on the subject (see p. 12). The passage I refer to is as follows. "Many of us" "~~think that~~" "the Scriptures ascribe the remission of sins to Christ's death, with an emphasis so peculiar, that we ought to consider this event as having a special influence in removing punishment, as a condition or method of pardon, without which repentance would not avail us, at least to that extent which is now promised by the Gospel." See *A Sermon delivered at the Ordination of the Rev. Jared Sparks to the Pastoral Care of the First Independent Church in Baltimore, May 5, 1819. By William Ellery Channing, Minister of the Church of Christ, in Federal Street, Boston.* P. 33, 34.

advocate appear to say what he does not say ; and thus proves, to those who believe him, that Dr. Priestley is grossly ignorant of the records of antiquity, that he flatly contradicts obvious facts in the Jewish history, that he is directly inconsistent with himself, and that, in short, there is no reliance to be placed on his evidence, nor any weight allowed to his reasonings.

After bringing some extracts from Josephus and Philo, and maintaining (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 409) that “ in no other parts of their works do either of these Writers seem to have any ideas that have the least connection with those which are suggested by the *modern doctrine* of Atonement,” (that is, as I have repeatedly shown, of satisfaction to the justice of God, necessary, at the least, to *enable* him to extend his mercy,) Dr. Priestley continues, “ If we look into “ the writings of the more modern Jews, we shall see “ sufficient reason to conclude, that THIS doctrine “ always was, and still is, absolutely unknown to “ them :” and he adduces some passages from Maimonides, Abrabinel, and Netto, to prove that the Jews rely on the free mercy of God, and that they did not consider “ any kind of mediation ” as “ necessary to reconcile the claims of justice with those of mercy.” In order to refute this position, the Dean adduces a variety of passages from our learned countryman, Outram, which prove that the modern Jews regarded the sin-offerings of the Law in the light of *instituted substitution*, accepted by the mercy of God in lieu of the life of the offender. The weight of their opinions in the controversy may be briefly shown

and has often explicitly stated his meaning, a doctrine far beyond what the Dean understands by the expression. *See above*, p. 163.

But this is not all. After asserting that Dr. Priestley maintains "in this place," (though Dr. Priestley does not maintain it, but Dr. Magee in his stead,) "that neither ancient nor modern Jews ever conceived an idea *of expiatory sacrifice*," he proceeds to declare, that Dr. Priestley "contends in another (p. 426), that this notion," viz. of expiatory sacrifice, "has arisen from the circumstance of the simple religion of Christ having been 'entrusted to such vessels as were the Apostles;' for, adds he, 'the Apostles were Jews, and had to do with Jews, and consequently represented Christianity in a Jewish dress,'—and this more particularly 'in the business of sacrifices.'" The passages in single inverted commas, are regularly marked by the Dissertator as quotations; (see above, p. 118). The variations are not very essential in point of import, except that the *first* gives a *different style of expression*, from that of Dr. Priestley, and is obviously intended to make it appear as objectionable as possible:* but they serve to show how loosely the

* Dr. Priestley's words (*immediately* following the passage quoted in p. 150) are, "With this great and simple scheme of religion, the Apostles were intrusted, that they might publish it for the benefit of the world. And when we consider what vessels they were that it was deposited in," (evidently alluding to St. Paul's own words, 'We have this treasure in earthen vessels,') "and to what immediate use it was to be applied," &c. *Theological Repository*, vol. i. p. 426.

Dean *quotes*; and may put some on their guard; how they argue from his professed quotations. After this statement, he comes to the following conclusion from the contradictory sentiments which he charges upon Dr. Priestley:

“Now, if the Jews had *no* notion whatever of expiatory sacrifice, it remains to be accounted for, how the cloathing the Christian doctrine of redemption in a *Jewish* dress, could have led to this notion. It is true, he adds, that over the *Jewish disguise*, which had been thrown on this doctrine *by the Apostles*, another was drawn by Christians. But if the Jewish dress bore *no* relation to a doctrine of atonement, then the Christian disguise is the only one. And thus the Christians have deliberately, without any foundation laid for them, *either by Heathens or Jews*, superinduced the notion of an expiatory sacrifice, on the simple doctrines of the Gospel: converting *figurative language*, into a *literal* exposition of *what was known never to have had a real existence!!!*” [The preceding extract is given with the Dean’s Italics, &c.] *Disc. and Diss.* vol. i. p. 259.

Now this is very great nonsense, certainly; but then it is not Dr. Priestley’s. In the Dean of Cork’s sense of *expiatory sacrifice*, Dr. Priestley no where declares that the Jews had no notion of it whatever. And he no where says, that the Jewish dress in which the Christian doctrine of Redemption is clothed, bore no relation to *a* doctrine of Atonement. What he maintains is, that figures and allusions, founded upon the ritual atonements of the Law, having been employed by the Apostles and primitive Fathers, to express the Christian “scheme of salvation and redemption” (see above, p. 148), though these figurative expressions have no real relation whatever to

hereafter: it is enough for my present purpose to observe, that this is not the strict notion of Atonement, in the present orthodox sense; and that the Dean could not but know, that it is not the sense in which Dr. Priestley declares that the modern doctrine of Atonement has ever been unknown to the Jews. On a subject requiring, in the present state of the controversy, the utmost precision, the Dean manifests neither precision in terms nor precision of thought. He obtains an easy victory over Dr. Priestley, by combatting, as his positions, what Dr. Priestley nowhere maintains.

After pursuing this system of attack through a dozen pages, the Dean comes (p. 273) to this conclusion: "The Reader may now be able to form a judgment, whether the doctrines of the Jewish Rabbis really support Dr. Priestley's position, that *among the modern Jews no notion of any scheme of sacrificial atonement*, or of any requisite for forgiveness, save repentance and reformation, has been found to have existence." The position here stated, which in different forms is several times repeated, I readily admit to be utterly unfounded; but then it is not Dr. Priestley's, nor any thing like it; and though the Dean may be allowed the merit of refuting, through Outram's quotations, that which every reader of Outram knew needed no refutation, he must also have the merit of inventing for Dr. Priestley a position which he does not maintain, and the contrary of which he undoubtedly knew to be the truth as well as the Dean himself.

I have minutely examined the statements of

Dr. Magee, made in opposition to those of Dr. Priestley, respecting the sentiments of Philo and Josephus ; and would willingly enter into detail on the subject ; but I have still many other things to lay before the Reader, and must content myself with briefly stating the results of my examination, with a specimen of the Dean's representation of Philo's views on the subject.

To destroy the effect of Dr. Priestley's citation of Philo, the Dean should have shown, that the philosophic Jew considered God in the light of a Being, whose favour could not be obtained by the services of his creatures, whose justice required a satisfaction to be made to it, and who could not, or would not, extend his mercy to them without such satisfaction. But, so far from this, even his own extracts prove that Philo considered the goodness and favour of God as the source of all spiritual good, and of the means of spiritual purification. And if the Reader will go from these extracts, and examine for himself, he can scarcely fail to be convinced, with Dr. Priestley, that Philo knew nothing corresponding to the "commonly received doctrine of Atonement." He will perceive, that Philo usually represents the *sin-offerings* of the Law in the light of *purifications* ; that he regarded the value of sacrifices, as depending upon the dispositions of the worshipper ; that he manifested exalted ideas of the *goodness*, as well as of the *holiness*, of the great First Cause ; that he did not consider his justice as interfering with the exercise of his mercy ; and that he never speaks of the necessity of a Mediator, who by his death might satisfy the claims of justice.

The philosophy and the religion of Philo, both conspired to produce devotion of soul; and his writings do vastly more credit to his principles and affections, than to his understanding. Even the mysticism of his master, Plato, had in it something singularly elevating and refining; and it was the spirit of the religion which Philo professed, to trace all to God. There was between them a general harmony and correspondence; and, rising in spiritual refinement far beyond those for whom the Mosaic ritual was originally instituted, he sought, and, with the aid of a lively imagination, he found, in the sacred books of his nation, ideas which they were never intended to convey, where the ordinary exercises of the understanding would have presented nothing but plain facts, or, at the most, significant services designed to lead a carnal people from objects of sense to those which are unseen and spiritual.

The speculations of Plato, and still more those of his followers, had almost represented the *Logos*, or system of ideas in the divine mind, as a distinct being from Him in whom it existed; and it is not wonderful, therefore, (since so many instances occur, in which sensible local manifestations were made to the people of Israel, of Him who is invisible and omnipresent,) that Philo, impressed with all the sublime but undefinable notions of his philosophy, should trace them in the Mosaic records. This he did: and sometimes employing the appellation *Logos* in the mystical sense of his philosophy, and sometimes for the personal medium of divine communications to his forefathers, he assigns to the latter, characteristics

which his 'philosophy alone had taught him ; and without, I am persuaded, any intentional reference to the Messiah, he gives to the supposed personal and constant Representative of God and Mediator of his will, qualities which the Christian, (coming to Philo with preconceived ideas, as Philo came to the Jewish Scriptures,) considers as implying that Philo had views corresponding with his own, respecting the means of acceptance with God, and the nature and offices of him whom He appointed to be the spiritual deliverer of mankind.*

A very partial acquaintance with Philo's speculations might yield support to the notions prevalent respecting the atonement made by the death of Christ: a more extensive and exact one must show this support to be itself groundless. I do not think that the

* If I thought the opinions of Philo of weight in the controversy, I would enter pretty fully into an examination of them; and I would show, in particular, how unjustly it is, that Dr. Magee, by his skilful tissue of detached passages, has given such a character to them, that the unlearned Reader is easily led to the belief that the Jew was acquainted with the Christian's notion of Atonement. I am relieved from the necessity of this, however, by the Dean's own appreciation of their value. For though, in p. 283, he represents Philo's " notions and expressions " as exhibiting " the doctrines of the Jewish Church, such at least as they " were held by the Jews of Alexandria in his day," yet, in the preceding leaf, p. 281, he informs us, that Philo is " pronounced, by " some of the highest authorities, to have been entirely ignorant " both of the language and customs of the Jews; and consequently to have fallen into gross errors in his representation of " the doctrines of their religion:" and upon this he censures Dr. Priestley, for inferring any thing from Philo's sentiments as to those of his Jewish contemporaries.

writings of a philosophical imaginative Jew of Alexandria, can be considered as decisive evidence of the prevalent opinions of the Jews, even of his own country ; and I lay no stress upon them : but I do maintain, that whatever argument they afford, is decidedly in Dr. Priestley's favour. They afford no support for the supposition that he regarded sacrifices as operating on the Divine Mind, except as any other offering of devotion ; or that he believed, that the great Source of goodness and blessedness cannot, or will not, accept of sincere and humble repentance and devotedness of the heart to him ; or that he held, as numbers still hold, that the wrath of God could not be pacified, or that his justice could not be satisfied, without the death of some divine Mediator.

If Dr. Magee understand the question at issue, he is determined that his unexamining Reader shall not. I must give a specimen of *his* " method of managing the testimonies furnished by " Philo ; and if any thing equal to it can be found in the writings of Dr. Priestley, fairly examined, I will allow that the Dean is not without excuse in stigmatizing him as he has done. It may serve that purpose, in reference to himself, which he professes to have had in view respecting Dr. Priestley ; and show " the degree of " reliance to be placed on the Writer's historical " exactness." The following are the words of Dr. Magee.

" And when he (Philo) speaks of that part of the Law, wherein it is said, that the man of guilt should fly to an appointed city of refuge, and not be acquitted till the *death of the High Priest*, he confesses (Περὶ Φυγαδ. pp. 465, 466) that

by this the Levitical High Priest cannot be literally meant, but that he must be in this case the type of one far greater: for “that the High Priest alluded to is not a man, but the sacred Logos, who is incapable of all sin, and who is said to have his head anointed with oil:”* and that the death of *this High Priest* is that which is here intended:—thus admitting the death of the *Logos*, whom he describes as the *anointed*, and allows to be typified by the Jewish High Priest, to be the means of recovery from a state of spiritual bondage, and of giving liberty to the soul. It is true, he allegorizes away this meaning again, according to his usual custom; but whilst he refines upon the doctrine, he at the same time testifies his existence in his day.” *Disc. and Diss.* vol. i. p. 285.

One is prepared for almost any strange result, to which the spiritualizing system of Philo might conduct him; but, before I examined the original, I could not help suspecting, that Philo surely could not, in any proper sense, express the admission which the Dean assigns to him, viz. the DEATH of the *Logos*, as the means of recovery from spiritual bondage. There is nothing in the representation he has given of the sentiments of Philo as to the efficacy of this event, which does not perfectly accord with my own view of the ends of the death of Christ; but the representation led me to ascertain the fact, and I find it altogether different from what the Dean has stated.

Philo is tracing out the secondary spiritual import of the Mosaic directions respecting the cities of refuge; and in the course of his object, he proves that

* Here, according to the Dean's notation, is a *continued quotation*: and yet, several lines, which would have shown that Philo was not referring to the Messiah, but to his own imaginary Logos, intervene between the last clause and those preceding.

he possessed noble views of the essential placability of the divine nature. He even speaks of the importance of such views to the sinner. "If any one regards the Deity, not as inexorable, but as compassionate through the mercy of his nature, even though he have sinned he will repent, influenced by the hope of forgiveness."* The whole passage is interesting and valuable; but I cannot enlarge upon it.

When he comes to his fourth topic, the time fixed for the return of the fugitives, (viz. the death of the High Priest,) he declares that he feels greatly embarrassed, because the Law hereby virtually appoints different periods of exile for the same offence. To get rid of his difficulty, he gives it as his opinion, that by the High Priest was not meant a human being, but the divine Word; and then he runs a curious parallel between the legal directions relative to the High Priest, and his own philosophical notions respecting the Logos. This enables him, he maintains, to show that the Law on this point is perfectly accordant with natural justice: "For" (says he, p. 467) "as long as that most sacred Word has life and power in the soul, no involuntary change can take place in it; since the Word, by its nature, has no concord or participation with any sin. But if it die, (not that it perishes itself, but is separated from our soul,) the opportunity of return is immediately afforded to sins of negligence. For if, while the Word remained in

* Ὁ τε γὰρ προλαβὼν ὡς οὐκ ἀπαράσχητον, ἀλλ' εὐμενὲς δι' ἡμερο-
τητα φύσεως, ἐστὶ το θεῖον, καὶ ἁμαρτήν πρότερον, αὐθὺς μετενοήσεν,
ἀμνηστίας ἐλπίδι. *De Profugis*, p. 464; *Par.* 1640.

a state of vigour within us, they were in exile, when it departs, they return to their former habitation.”*

Such are the views of Philo himself; and I maintain, without fear of confutation, (1) That the Jewish Philosopher does not admit the death of the Logos, in any other than a figurative sense: and (2) That so far from “admitting the death of the Logos” “to be the means of recovery from a state of spiritual bondage, and of giving liberty to the soul,” he expressly declares the contrary; and maintains, that the separation of the Logos from the soul of man, (which is all he means by its death,) is the cause of spiritual bondage, and the renewed supremacy of sin.

The Dean may shelter himself under his continuing sentence, that “he allegorizes away this meaning again:” but in fact Philo never gives it, nor any thing approaching to it. In endeavouring to throw the reproach on Dr. Priestley, of *managing* the testimony of Philo, he has involved himself in the reproach, with which I hesitate not to charge him, of not only managing, but directly misrepresenting it. If it be through mere negligence, that negligence, in such circumstances, is most culpable. And yet it is by such means, that he secures the appearance of victory; and long has he been supposed, by multitudes, to have established the incompetency of Dr. Priestley

* Έως μεν γαρ ὁ ἱερωτατος οὗτος λογος ζῇ και περιεστιν εν ψυχῇ, αμνηχανον τροπην ακουσιον εις αυτην κατελθειν. αμετοχος γαρ και απαραδεκτος παντος ειναι πεφυκεν ἀμαρτηματος. εαν δε αποθανῃ, ουκ αυτος διαφθαρεις, αλλ’ εκ της ἡμετερας ψυχης διαλευχθεις, καθοδος ευθους διδοται τοις ακουσιοις σφαλμασιν. Ει γαρ μενοντος και υγιαινοντος εν ἡμιν ἐξωκιζετο, μετανισταμενου παντως εισοικισθησεται.

as a reasoner, and his unfaithfulness as a witness. With respect to himself, it is my deliberate opinion, that he has been led, by the unlawful system and objects of his warfare, into numerous refined but groundless insinuations and artful misstatements, which, were he a Unitarian, would be held, (and justly,) to destroy, thenceforwards, the validity of his evidence or decision on any controverted point.

On the Dean's summary conclusion of the discussion, I must make a few general observations ; and will therefore quote it.

—— “ the explicit declarations of Josephus, on the expiatory virtue of sacrifice, and those of Philo, on the necessity of *mediation* and *propitiation* to render even our good works acceptable to a God offended at the corruption of our nature, and of some means of *ransom* and *redemption* to restore man to his lost estate, sufficiently evince the existence of those great leading principles of atonement, *expiation* and *propitiation*, which Dr. Priestley utterly denies to have had any place among the Jews, in the days of those two celebrated Writers.” *Disc. and Diss.* vol. i. p. 290.

On this passage I offer the following remarks.

(1) If, by *expiatory virtue*, he mean *effect in satisfying the justice of God*, Josephus says *nothing* to authorize the assertion. If he merely mean by it, that, as an external sign of internal dispositions, God accepted a sacrifice, and granted pardon in consequence, it is perfectly consistent with the views of Dr. Priestley. The Dean comes to a rapid conclusion from an insulated fact.* If the conclusion

* Dr. Magee refers (vol. i. p. 281) to Josephus's account of the sacrifice offered by Cain after the murder of Abel ; and infers, that,

had been a just one, I would have passed by his offence against “cautious induction;” but it is utterly irrelevant, or utterly unfounded. And it is one of the many cases, in which, under a loose form of expression, this celebrated controversialist has contrived to make a mere logomachy appear like powerful argument. Ascertain its import, and it proves altogether without force, or altogether groundless.

(2) The Dean has adduced no evidence, and I believe can find none, which can in any degree prove that Philo considered something beyond the disposition of the agent, as necessary to render his good works acceptable to God. That which he has adduced, rests on a mistranslation.*

in the judgment of the Jewish Historian, “the *wrath* of God was “*averted* BY sacrifice; and that life, which according to strict “justice, was to be paid for the life which had been taken away, “was preserved THROUGH VIRTUE *of the offering made.*” This he considers a proof that Josephus admitted the *propitiatory virtue* of sacrifice. All that Josephus says is, that Cain, *through* (by means of) sacrifice, made supplication to God not to take severe vengeance upon him, and that God remitted the punishment of his crime. Josephus believed in the propitiatory virtue of the supplication, which Cain, he tells us, made by means of the sacrifice (*δι' αὐτῆς*). And this is proved by the other passages referred to by Dr. Magee.

* The Dean says (vol. i. p. 284) that Philo represents man as decome “so degenerate ‘that even his virtues are of no value, “‘but through the goodness and favour of God’ (*Περὶ τοῦ το Χεῖρ*. “p. 166).” This is not the view of the Jewish Philosopher. According to his usual system, he is spiritualizing the words of Abraham (Gen. xviii. 9, &c.); and he speaks of the influence of virtue on the happiness of man: but, he says, the answer of Abraham is deserving of praise, because he confesses in it, that not even virtue, of itself, without divine wisdom, is sufficient to

(3) The Dean has adduced no evidence, and I believe can find none, which can in any degree prove it to have been the opinion of Philo, that, where the sinner sincerely repented of his past offences and turned unto God, He would not, or could not, without some intermediate agency, interposition, or suffering, extend his mercy to the sinner, and grant his pardon.

(4) The Dean has adduced no evidence, and I believe can find none, that, in the times of Josephus and Philo, there existed, among the Jews, the notions of expiation and propitiation, in any sense in which Dr. Priestley has denied them to exist. Dr. Priestley denies nothing which the Dean has proved; the Dean has proved nothing which Dr. Priestley denies.

Before I close this Section, I think it right to state, that I certainly consider Dr. Priestley, in the last paper of the Essay so often referred to, as dwelling too exclusively on the milder features of heathenism. Their extraordinary sacrifices, designed to avert calamity, and sometimes their customary sacrifices, were decisive indications of the notions frequently held by them, of the wrathful revengeful character of their deities. But Dr. Priestley does not deny this.* The

promote our welfare: μηδε την αρετην ανευ θειας επιφροσυνης, ικανη εξ εαυτης ωφελειν ειναί.

I might notice other instances, in which, through want of the connection, or by a forced translation, the Dean's citations have a complexion different from what Philo gave them.

* In the second volume of *Discourses relating to the Evidences of*

only essential question is, whether they regarded the Divine Being (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 416) “as, of himself, unpropitious to his offending creatures; so as necessarily to require *the interposition of some other being in their favour.*” When he affirms (and thereby gives the Dean an opportunity for some of his most plausible censures,) that “neither the ancient nor modern Jews, nor any nations of the Heathen world, appear to have had the least knowledge, or betray the least sense,* of their want of any expedient of satisfaction for sin, besides repentance and a good life,” he cannot justly be understood to deny (what he has often maintained in other places) the tendency of the mind to rest on external signs of humiliation and fear, instead of the repentance of the heart, and on costly oblations and bloody sacrifices, instead of the obedience of the life. They did not suppose that the Deity would not forgive the repentant sinner; but they looked to other

Revealed Religion, (printed in Philadelphia, and reprinted in England in 1796, some years before Dr. Magee's first edition,) Dr. Priestley gives a detailed *View of Heathen Worship*, which might have been extracted by Dr. Magee, instead of his Fifth Dissertation, and the close of his Thirty-third. Dr. Priestley knew, as well as Dr. Magee, the prevalence of Human Sacrifices. The Dean's apparent victory over him consists in his misrepresenting, in toto, the object of Dr. Priestley's reasoning on the subject.

* In the original passage, there is no comma from *or* to *sin*. The Dean (see above, p. 143) places the comma after *want*: I think I am right in placing it after *sense*. The Dean's punctuation makes Dr. Priestley deny, what he well knew, that the Heathens and even the Jews resorted to *easier* means of obtaining the favour of the Deity, than repentance and reformation.

and easier means of rendering him propitious. When the Dean (vol. i. p. 292) represents Dr. Priestley as maintaining *that in no nation, ancient or modern, Jew or Heathen, has any idea of a doctrine of atonement,—ever existed*, he manifests complete ignorance of the sentiments which he opposes, or complete carelessness in his representation of them.*

* It may possibly prevent some unnecessary misunderstanding, if I state here, that wherever, in cases connected with moral guilt, sacrifices were enjoined to remove the desecration of the offender, the offering of those sacrifices was a necessary consequence of repentance; and that whenever sacrifices of consecration, or of thanksgiving, or any other ritual services were enjoined, the offering of them was necessarily included in the obedience of the life.

SECTION IV.

On the Charges made against Dr. Priestley, in the Discourses and Dissertations, concerning Reverence for the Scriptures.

If the assertions and citations which have been already considered in this Chapter had been well founded, I should have been obliged to admit, (and I would have done it, however painfully,) that Dr. Priestley's evidence and opinions are without weight in the controversy. I have, I believe, shown ground enough for the conviction, that Bishop Magee's* charges against him are without adequate foundation, and that they therefore fall with redoubled force on himself.

There are cases, however, in which he has some advantage ; and he has made the most of it. In the ardour and fearlessness of Dr. Priestley's style of controversy, he has sometimes used expressions which have furnished the opponents of Unitarianism with reasonable cause for censure. Of these, as might be expected, Dr. Magee avails himself triumphantly ; and from him they have been quoted, and requoted, till multitudes have been led to believe that Dr. Priestley was destitute of reverence for the Scriptures, and even of submission to the divine

* As it is understood that the elevation of Dr. Magee to the episcopal seat is now settled, I shall not henceforward employ his former title.

authority. To those who have read his writings, especially some of those which are least controversial, I need not say that this stigma is utterly inconsistent with the truth.

Dr. Magee's *Index* was obviously drawn up, if not by the Author himself, by some one who understood his system very well. Under "*Priestley (Dr.)*" we find the following topics: "*His irreverent language concerning the Sacred Writers;*" "*charges the Sacred Writers as ignorant and blundering;*" "*instances of his mode of evading the force of Scripture authority.*" Many, probably, have been satisfied with these summary statements: I must, of course enter a little into particulars. It will appear that the Bishop has done his best, to give the most unfavourable view in his power of Dr. Priestley's statements.

The following quotation will give Dr. Magee's representation of the most objectionable expression which he has produced from Dr. Priestley's writings; and, probably, the most objectionable which he could have discovered.

" Endeavouring to prove, in opposition to Dr. Price, that the expressions in John vi. 62, *What, and if you shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?* furnish no argument in favour of Christ's pre-existence, he uses the following remarkable language—that "*though not satisfied with any interpretation of this extraordinary passage, yet rather than believe our Saviour to have existed in any other state before the creation of the world, or to have left some state of great dignity and happiness when he came hither, he would have recourse to the old and exploded Socinian idea of Christ's actual ascent into heaven, or of his imagining that he had been carried up*

ther in a vision ; which, like that of St. Paul, *he had not*
able to distinguish from a reality : nay, he would not build
 article of faith, of such magnitude, on *the correctness of*
his recollection and representation of our Lord's language ;
 and so strange and incredible does the hypothesis of a pre-exis-
 tent state appear, that *sooner than admit it, he would suppose*
whole verse to be an interpolation, or that THE OLD
 TESTAMENT DICTATED ONE THING, AND HIS AMANUENSIS WROTE
 ANOTHER." (*Letters to Dr. Price*, pp. 57, 58, &c.)—Thus is
 completed the triumph of Unitarian philosophy over revela-
 tion : and thus is the charge of incredulity against the pre-
 cedent philosopher of the present day refuted. For what is
 more too monstrous for his belief, if you except only the
 truths of the Gospel ?" *Diss. and Diss.* vol. i. p. 87.

The above quotation from Dr. Magee, I have given
 exactly as I find it in his work ; with all its appa-
 ratus of inverted commas, punctuation, italics, and
 capitals. And the Reader will perceive that he
 presents his citation of Dr. Priestley as a CONTI-
 NUED quotation. Now (1) I have Dr. Magee's *own*
authority to declare,* that it is " a GROSS FALSIFICA-
 TION of his author, to give, as *one continued quota-*
tion from him, (as the established meaning of the

form here employed" by Dr. Magee "*unequivo-*
cally, implies,) that which is an arbitrary selection
 of words, drawn violently together from various
 parts of a lengthened context, in the present case
 amounting" to nearly two pages as full as his
 own. (2) The former part of it, as far as the
 word "*reality*," though expressly introduced by the
 Bishop, " as an instance *in his own words*" (viz. Dr.
 Priestley's,) is merely the Bishop's *representation* of

* See the passage from his Postscript quoted above, p. 119.

Dr. Priestley's words; and one which shows his unhappy disposition to misrepresent, in order to beat down, the object of his attack. Let the Reader judge for himself, when he has read Dr. Priestley's "own words," which I shall soon lay before him. (3) By means of large OMISSIONS in this *continued quotation*, by the INSERTION of *a few words not in the original*, and by the CURTAILMENT of the citation before the connection is properly ended, the Bishop has kept out of view the fact, that the "article of faith" and the "hypothesis" which Dr. Priestley refers to, is not merely that Christ pre-existed, but that he was the "Maker of the world." I never met with any polemical work, in which the simplest principles of controversial equity are so frequently and so grossly violated as in the writings of Dr. Magee.

But this does not excuse Dr. Priestley. Nevertheless I think the Reader will rise from the following account of the matter, with impressions different from those conveyed by Dr. Magee's quotation.

In Dr. Priestley's Fifth Letter to Dr. Price, (on the meaning of John vi. 32,) he adduces the expressions of our Lord, 'This is my body,' and 'except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you,' as proofs that the literal meaning of his words cannot always be received. He then states, that the discourse in which the expression in question occurs, is full of the strongest figures; and that the literal interpretation, which implies that the human nature of Christ had been in heaven, favours no hypothesis except that of the Polish Socinians. He then proceeds as follows:

“ Though I reject your interpretation of this text, I do not pretend to be quite satisfied with any other interpretation of it. I am, however, abundantly satisfied that yours is not the true one. And this is far from being the only text about which the best critics cannot entirely please themselves. For my part, I should much sooner have recourse to the idea of Christ’s actual ascent into heaven, or of his imagining that he had been carried up thither, in a vision which (like that of Paul) he had not been able to distinguish from a reality, at the time that he received his commission, than to yours, of his having existed in an unembodied state before the creation of the world, and his having left some state of great dignity and happiness when he came hither.”* *Letters to Dr. Price, in Defences of Unitarianism for 1787*, p. 56.

Dr. Priestley then continues to argue, that Dr. Price’s hypothesis is no clue to our Lord’s real meaning, from what he deems the fact, that the Apostles did not so understand it; that there is no indication whatever of their viewing him, during his ministry, as a great pre-existent spirit and their Creator; and that, in the Acts of the Apostles, there is no trace of their having so much as heard of such an opinion being advanced by any believers in Christ. “ It is as evident from this consideration,” continues Dr. Priestley, “ as any negative can be, that no such opinion as *that of Christ having been the Maker of the World*, was ever taught by the Apostles; and therefore any interpretation of their writings which implies their teaching it, must be wrong, whether we be able to hit upon the true sense of them or not.”

* This paragraph I entreat the discriminating Reader to compare with the Bishop’s *quotation* of it, in p. 194. I need not point out to him how much the latter varies in form, and in impression, from Dr. Priestley’s own words.

This conclusion, founded on the principles which are stated in the passage quoted in p. 170, I think equally just and important; and had Dr. Priestley stopped here, the most ill-natured objector would have found little room for censure. But, urged on by an expression of Dr. Price's, (which the Bishop does not notice,) he proceeds with the offensive declaration in the following paragraph:

“To be explicit with you, I would not, as you say, p. 394, ‘build an article of faith of such magnitude, on the correctness of John’s recollection, and representation, of our Lord’s language.’ So strange and incredible does your hypothesis appear to me, that rather than admit it, I would suppose the whole to be an interpolation, or that the old Apostle dictated one thing, and his amanuensis wrote another. For you would not scruple to say as much if you had found any passage, in which it was said that Moses, or any of the old prophets, had been the maker of the world.” *Defences*, 1787, p. 58.

The quotation which he adopts from Dr. Price, is altogether inadmissible by those who believe, as I do, (see p. 81,) that the inspiration of the Apostles caused the accurate recollection of all that Christ had said, if not in the very words, at least in their full and correct import. The second declaration, which the Bishop appears (by his mode of printing it) to consider as the most objectionable, I do not. It throws the error, if error there were, on the amanuensis or the transcriber.*

* Among the specimens of the utility of the Syriac Version in correcting the present Hebrew, Dr. Kennicott (*Diss.* ii. p. 359) adduces Prov. xxvi. 5. “This and the preceding verse contain ‘these celebrated aphorisms, ‘Answer not a fool, according to his folly;’ and, ‘Answer a fool, according to his folly.’ I would

I do not undertake to defend the mode of expression here employed by Dr. Priestley ; but I am not

“ beg the Reader to reflect, whether it be possible for words to
 “ express a more clear and absolute contradiction. If such a prohi-
 “ bition, and such a command, had been both really given, unre-
 “ strained by any circumstances, I should honour that casuist, who
 “ could decide, how a wise man is bound to answer a fool's ques-
 “ tion : since, if he answer *foolishly*, he must offend against the
 “ prohibition ; if *wisely*, he must offend against the command.”

After further argument on the supposed contradiction, the learned Critic gives an unqualified approbation to the reading of the Syriac in the 5th verse, ‘ Answer a fool according to *thine own wisdom* ;’ and he thus proceeds : “ If any thing can be yet wanting
 “ to recommend this variation (as being certainly genuine) besides
 “ the perfect propriety of the Syriac, and that *insult upon common*
 “ *sense* contained in the present Hebrew,” &c.

Now, as far as I can judge, the common reading affords a good and satisfactory sense : *Answer not a fool according to his folly*, absurdly, and in unison with his foolish levity, or arrogant censures, *lest thou also be like him* ; *Answer a fool according to his folly*, with that severity which his folly deserves, *lest he be wise in his own conceit*. And I suspect the Syriac reading to have originated, like many other various readings, in the difficulties of the original, which the transcriber, or translator, found obscure, and wished to improve. With this view, I cannot perceive the “ CLEAR AND ABSOLUTE CONTRADICTION,” or “ THE INSULT UPON COMMON SENSE,” or, as Dr. Kennicott afterwards says, “ THE FLAT CONTRADICTION :” but he who is satisfied that such is the case, need not hesitate in maintaining, with the opponent of Bishop Bull, that “ Solomon never said so.” (*Diss. ii. p. 362.*)

My object in citing these remarks of Dr. Kennicott, is to show that considerable latitude is used, by *Orthodox* Critics, in speaking of passages which do not accord with their preconceived opinions or deliberate judgment. And I beg the Reader to consider, what use would have been made of the expressions in the preceding paragraph which are printed in small capitals, if they had been written by a Unitarian.

aware of any serious objection to the reasoning. If, in any case, there were no alternative but that of rejecting a passage which, in the judgment of the individual, could not be reconciled to doctrines taught by the general tenor of Revelation, and its most express declarations, as well as agreeable to the soundest views of religion derived from the providence and works of God,—how could he hesitate in the course to be pursued? But there is another and

* The design of the Gospel is to promote the world's best interests. He whose adorable perfections we are required to imitate, *so loved the world*, that he sent his well-beloved Son to save it. And that well-beloved Son loved the world, and gave himself up to suffering and to death, to make it holy and happy. And yet his beloved Apostle, who in a peculiar degree displayed the influence of his Lord's spirit, and showed that that spirit was love, as God is love, is represented as writing thus, '*Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world: If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.*' The *plain and obvious meaning* is in opposition to the dictates of nature and the precepts of revelation.—*Take the words in their connection, and interpret them by the general tenor of Scripture and the plain principles of reason*, and they have a very important meaning, which by degrees becomes so familiar to us, that we consider this, without hesitation, as, *exclusively*, the *plain and obvious meaning*.

The course to which, in such cases, (and they are numerous,) every one allows common sense to direct him, the Unitarian thinks may be justly and advantageously employed, on all occasions where there is an apparent discrepancy in the records of Revelation. And I imagine that if, after all, no justifiable meaning could be found that would remove the inconsistency which one meaning of the above-mentioned precept has with the noblest principles of Christian duty, few would hesitate in adopting the views of the fearless Unitarian Reformer in another case, and saying, Rather than believe that I am forbidden by the Gospel to love that which God

a better system, which Dr. Priestley has himself stated (see p. 170). It is, to acquiesce in the plain and express teachings of Revelation, sanctioned by the best views of the divine perfections and government we can derive from the united light of Reason and Revelation, confiding that the time will come, when all obscurity shall be done away, and the occasional *appearance* of inconsistency be for ever removed.

With whatever sentiments, however, the Reader who is hostile to Unitarianism still views the language of Dr. Priestley, he cannot but be convinced, that, by giving, as a CONTINUED QUOTATION from Dr. Priestley, a passage in which there are several transpositions and additions,—in which, between parts separated only by a colon, *there is more than a page of connected argument*,*—and in which, by an extraneous addition, an omission, and a curtailment, he

loves, and for which Christ died, I would suppose the whole verse to be an interpolation, or that the aged Apostle dictated one thing, and his amanuensis wrote another.

* A similar instance of injustice occurs in Dr. Pye Smith's *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, vol. i. p. 58, where, adducing several of Dr. Priestley's most obnoxious, and, in my judgment, very hasty and censurable expressions, he gives, as one continued quotation, clauses from various papers, and even different volumes, of the *Theological Repository* (for the object of which, see above, p. 139); and in one instance gives as Dr. Priestley's, that which Dr. Priestley says another might argue. I have long entertained a great respect for Dr. Pye Smith; and it has disappointed my hopes concerning his long-expected work, to see such strong indications of his being carried away by the prevailing system of controversy, and attempting to bear down Unitarianism by the real or supposed errors and

has given a directly erroneous view of Dr. Priestley's object in his obnoxious statement,—Bishop Magee is guilty, according to his own words, of “*GROSS FALSIFICATION of his Author.*”

Those who wish to judge righteous judgment, must not form their opinions of Unitarians and Unitarianism from a writer who is continually guilty of similar breaches of controversial equity.

The second reference made in the Index to Dr. Priestley's “irreverent language concerning the Sacred Writers,” is vol. i. p. 173, where, in the long sentence of invectives, the close of which has been already quoted (p. 77), Dr. Magee says, “When in
“such parts, as propound Gospel truths of a contex-
“ture too solid to admit of an escape in figure and
“allusion, the Sacred Writers are charged as hung-
“lers, producing ‘lame accounts, improper quota-
“tions, and inconclusive reasonings,’ (*Dr. Priestley's*
“*12th Letter to Mr. Burn,*) and philosophy is con-
“sequently called in to rectify their errors:”—

Respecting this, I can merely say that I have, with

faults of those who embrace it. In one instance (p. 114), he has allowed personal feelings to lead him to make charges, deeply and directly affecting the moral and religious character and usefulness of several individuals; when, if there had been any solid ground for such charges, he ought to have specified the individuals to whom he referred, or to have been silent. I trust that the native candour of his mind will lead him, if possible, to wipe off the stigma which he has, by implication, thrown upon some who could not have deserved it; particularly one, who takes an eminent station among the public defenders and promoters of Unitarianism.

much difficulty, obtained a copy of Dr. Priestley's *Letters to the Rev. Edward Burn* (Birm. 1790); that it contains only six Letters; that I can discover in the publication nothing corresponding to the Bishop's *quotation*; but that I have discovered various passages which display the manly intrepidity and ingenuousness of the writer's character;* and that I am

* Dr. Priestley says (*Pref. p. vi.*), "Mr. Burn would not have entertained so frightful an opinion of me as he expresses, if we had been better acquainted." I do not doubt that this would be the case with multitudes who derive their opinions of this eminent Unitarian solely from the statements of his opponents.

I select a few passages from the *Letters to Burn*, as connected with the subject before us, or characteristic of the Author.

"Where have I said that *the reason of the individual is the sole umpire in matters of faith*? I call upon you to produce any thing that I have written that will bear such a construction. You must absolutely have been reading Bolingbroke, Hume, or Voltaire, and have imagined their writings to be mine. I think I may say that no man now living in this country, nor perhaps in any other, has written more to prove the very reverse of what you ascribe to me, viz. *the insufficiency of human reason, and the necessity of divine revelation.*" P. 26.

"Judging of the *tree* by its *fruits*, I shall willingly take my chance with pious, virtuous, and candid Unitarians, with such men as Dr. Lardner, Dr. Jebb, &c. who *brought no railing accusations* against any man (though sentenced by your church *without doubt to perish everlastingly*) rather than with those who scruple no misrepresentation, or abuse, to promote their cause, though in itself it should be ever so good. Fearing God, and respecting his *truth*, I hope I shall never fear what *man* may say of me, or do to me, least of all in another world, where, happily, your power does not extend." P. 28.

"These principles, which are common to all Christians, habitually impressed upon the mind, would lead us all to set God always

willing to believe his virulent opponent would have felt himself disarmed of some of his most unhallowed weapons, if he had *calmly* read *for himself* the work which he here professes to quote.

I formerly took for granted, that Dr. Priestley had really said, what Bishop Magee represents him as saying, and as he represents it. My experience, derived from patient and careful examination into a great number of his citations, bears me out in believing, that Dr. Priestley has, in no instance, charged them in the manner which Dr. Magee here represents; that in no case immediately connected with the doctrines of the Gospel, does he employ such language at all; and that where he has used these offensive expressions, the connection, or some subsequent explanation, would supply what would disarm them of their most offensive import.

Perhaps the following instance of Dr. Priestley's supposed irreverence to the Scriptures, may have furnished *one part* of the Bishop's *continued quotation*; unless, indeed, (I say it only as a conjecture,)

before us; and thus constantly *living as seeing him who is invisible*, cherishing an habitual love and reverence for him, and having an immortal state hereafter in continual prospect, our hearts will be loosened from all improper attachments to this world, all inordinate desires will be suppressed, all undue resentments stifled, and we shall rejoice in nothing so much as the pursuit of truth, and the uniform practice of virtue." P. 31.

"With many of the clergy, both in the church of England and the church of Rome, I have long been in habits of intimacy, and I esteem their acquaintance and friendship an honour, and so I do that of the liberal and intelligent of all persuasions; and I am far from confining all good sense to those who think as I do." P. 35.

the quotation should prove to have been made from Mr. Burn, and not from Dr. Priestley.

In the long sentence already noticed, this passage occurs : “When we find Dr. Priestley, besides his charge against the Writers of the New Testament before recited, represent in his Letter to Dr. Price, the narration of Moses concerning the creation and fall of man as a lame account :”—

Why did not the Bishop add Priestley’s own retraction of the expression. In his *Defences* for 1787 (p. 65), Dr. Priestley thus writes to his friend Dr. Price :* “I consider the account that Moses has given, as *his own*, since he no where says that it is not ; and consequently the best that he could collect from tradition : and having very particularly examined it, I scrupled not to call it a *very lame one*. I wish, however, that instead of the term *lame*, I had said *imperfect*, which has the same meaning, and might have given less offence.” He then reminds his excellent correspondent, (whose name is associated in my mind with the most affec-

* I cannot help offering the Reader the following testimonial of this excellent man to the merits of Dr. Priestley, contained in the Appendix to his *Sermons on the Christian Doctrine* (1787).

“You, Sir, are in various respects so distinguished, as to be above any competition of which I am capable. There is, however, a merit in which I can claim an equal share with you : And that is, the merit of giving the public an example (little known among religious men) of two friends who, considering nothing as essential but a sincere desire to know and follow truth, preserve an invariable respect for one another, notwithstanding very great differences of opinion on religious subjects.”

tionate respect for the virtues and graces of his character, and the humility, integrity, and profundity of his understanding,) that he himself regarded the “Mosaic history of the creation, the fall, the deluge, &c., as a popular history, which should be read with great allowances for the ancient manner of instruction by emblems and hieroglyphics.”

When that pressure which has prevented the elasticity of the mind from its due operation, is by any cause quickly removed, the natural tendency is, to extend itself beyond proper limits. I believe that, in some few instances, this was the case with Dr. Priestley. But why are his more matured and judicious sentiments to be left out of sight, when passing the judgment of theological odium on his earlier or most hasty productions. In some things Dr. Priestley was wrong; in these let him be confuted. In some he was precipitate; in these let him be censured. But if, to pass a sweeping censure upon the close argumentation, the comprehensive views, and the extensive investigations, of such a man as Priestley, for a small number of hasty expressions,—to aggravate these by misquotations and misrepresentations,—and to pass by, unnoticed, innumerable proofs of piety and uprightness and benevolence, as well as of sound judgment, eminent talents, and extensive acquirements,—be the only way to the mitred chair, he in whose mind Christian principle has taken a deep root, may well say *Nolo episcopari*.*

* This paragraph was written several months before the elevation of the Dean of Cork to the episcopal seat.

The Bishop's next example of irreverent language concerning the Scriptures, I have already considered (see p. 177, &c.); and I proceed to the last reference which he gives under this head. Speaking of the prophecy in Is. liii, Dr. Magee says,

“Indeed so evident and undeniable is the application to Christ, that Dr. Priestley himself, while he is laboriously employed, in withdrawing from the support of Christianity, most of the prophecies of the Old Testament, (which, he says, Christians, by “*following too closely the writers of the New Testament*,” have been erroneously led to attribute to Christ, *Theol. Rep.* vol. v. p. 213,) yet pronounces it impossible to explain this of any other but Jesus Christ (p. 226); and considers the application of it to Jeremiah by Grotius as not deserving a refutation.” *Disc. and Diss.* vol. i. p. 410.

Here a man who has written more, and to more effect, than any other since the time of Lardner, in defence of Revelation, and of Christianity in particular, is represented as **LABORIOUSLY EMPLOYED** to deprive it of some of its main supports.

If the Bishop of Raphoe can solve all the difficulties which hang over the prophecies usually considered as referring to the Messiah, he will certainly render a most essential service to Revelation; but he will not labour, in one direction, with more goodwill to Christianity, than Dr. Priestley did in another. As far as my judgment goes, Dr. Priestley's theory is erroneous; but the error did not arise from a want of elevated and ardent piety, or of the highest value and reverence for Revelation.

The question is, Were the Apostles ever influenced, in their application of the ancient prophecies, by the Jewish modes of citing Scripture? or, are we

to regard them as always under the immediate direction of the spirit of God in that application? If the latter, there can be no error ; and all the difficulties must be in appearance only. If the former, it must necessarily be sometimes a matter of doubt, in what light we are to view their citations of prophecy. Each opinion is attended with great difficulties ; and, notwithstanding a strong prepossession in favour of that which gives the sanction of inspiration, in a greater or a less degree, to their express interpretations of prophecy, I cannot throw an imputation on the piety, or judgment, or humility, or submissiveness to divine authority, of those who take a different view of the subject.*

* Till some *express declaration* of the Scriptures is produced, that the Apostles were endowed, by *direct* inspiration, with the power of interpreting and applying the prophecies of the Old Testament, I cannot regard those who oppose this opinion, (because, after careful investigation, they believe that the Apostles, in some instances, erred in their interpretation,) as deficient in reverence to divine authority. Several expressions appear to me to authorize the belief, that their inspiration extended to this point ; and, independently of this consideration, it seems inconceivable that, where revealed truth was concerned, the Apostles should have been left to support it by a false application of prophecy.

Still less can I conceive it possible that, on a point so intimately connected with the proof of his divine authority, our Lord could himself have been in error. And it is with great satisfaction that I quote the following passage from Mr. Belsham's *Life of Mr. Lindsey*, p. 228, which shows that my respected Friend views the subject in the same light.

“ That our Lord misunderstood and misapplied the prophecies of the Old Testament, relating to the Messiah, is a position main-

e distinction should ever be carefully kept in between our own theories and the declarations

by Dr. Priestley, which did not meet with the general concurrence of those who were disposed to think with him upon others. Dr. Jebb and Mr. Lindsey had some reason to say that his main argument failed him." Our Lord so expressly his knowledge of the true sense and application of the prophecies in the Scriptures; he so frequently interprets without the least error, and with the highest tone of authority, those prophecies which relate to the Messiah; he so gravely rebukes his disciples for not understanding what he had so plainly and repeatedly said; and after his resurrection he so explicitly assumes an authority to "open their understandings that they might understand the Scriptures;" that to deny to Jesus a power which he so directly exercises, looks like an attack upon his veracity, and is little less than charging him with vanity and arrogance. Nor are we by necessity of the case driven to this conclusion. For it is not that Dr. Priestley, though he has attempted it, as indeed his argument required, has succeeded in any one instance in proving that our Lord has actually fallen into error, in his explanation and application of the prophetic Scriptures. This however is an interesting topic of discussion; and the friends of rational knowledge will rejoice to have the question set in a proper light."

Nothing could be more remote from Dr. Priestley's intention, to charge Christ "with vanity and arrogance," or to make an attack upon his veracity; and, I am confident, Mr. Belsham does not mean to represent it in that point of view, though his words seem to imply that it has somewhat of that character.

Priestley seems to have been too much influenced by the desire of removing from Revelation, those difficulties which had led many to infidelity, or afforded them some plausible reason for their infidelities. Difficulties may be removed from the minds of some; and still new difficulties thereby increased in the minds of others. In such cases, the true way is, to view the subject in *all* its different aspects; and it is much better (where a decision is not required

of Revelation. If the Apostles had asserted that the spirit revealed to them the import of the prophecies,

by any duty,) to bear uncertainty, than to decide upon too hasty a survey.

I do not object to his system of fearlessly pursuing truth wherever it appeared to lead him; but in the communication of opinion, Dr. Priestley certainly did not enough weigh the effects. Till he had satisfied himself, by repeated and deliberate examination, and by reviewing them in their different bearings, that his opinions on this subject were well-founded, it would, to say the least, have been wise, to confine them to those who would regard them only as materials for thinking. He did not enough consider, that opinions which are harmless to some, may strike at the root of all that is valuable in the minds of others who adopt them, or materially impede the admission of important truth among those who reject them. Few are able to discriminate between truths established by evidence, and the speculations which their advocates have connected with them. That which strikes the imagination, commonly fixes the attention more than that which appeals only to the understanding.

But it is probable that Dr. Priestley considered himself, in the *Theological Repository*, as writing for those alone who partook of his own independence of mind, and who would, generally speaking, be more likely to check him than to go beyond him: and the passage with which he closes his *Observations on the Inspiration of Christ* (*Theol. Rep.* vol. ii. p. 461), shows the system on which he had proceeded; and it should not be forgotten, by those who quote against him his most objectionable expressions. “ I wish to hear
“ what your learned and liberal readers may object to this essay,
“ as well as to those which have preceded it; both that I myself
“ may form a more decided judgment of what I have, perhaps
“ too hastily, advanced, as well as be directed in my future disqui-
“ sitions. I feel myself disposed to give free scope to my thoughts,
“ and I am the less concerned in this unrestrained course of inquiry,
“ as there will always, I hope, be some to hold the reins and
“ check me; and if the bridle be in a steady and able hand, I hope
“ I shall never be unwilling to obey it.”

or had declared that, in the application they made of them, they were following the light which they had received from above, Dr. Priestley would have bowed to their authority as readily as Dr. Magee.—It is a widely prevalent error, to attach to our own modes of interpretation, (and this, commonly, in proportion as we have not examined the foundation of them,) that importance and authority which belong only to the express teachings of Revelation. Whatever opposes the former, we consider as inconsistent with the reverence due to the word of God ; and the charge of irreverence is as easily made, (and not unfrequently with as little foundation,) as the charge of blasphemy against Stephen and against Paul. He who believes himself infallible, may write as Bishop Magee does ; but he must not expect that others will submit to his dicta, till he has given proof of his infallibility.

It would be easy to fill volumes with exposures of Dr. Magee's misrepresentations of Dr. Priestley and other Unitarian Writers. It is one of the worst features of his controversial system, that his misrepresentations are frequently so subtle, and his perversions of our arguments so refined, that what occupies him perhaps only a few lines, may require pages to develop. His most injurious charges wear, too, the form of insinuations. And they are frequently armed with all the pungency of sarcastic irony. The effect of this is obvious ; and, I fear, was intended. A charge fairly stated, and supported by evidence, may be met with evidence ; but the *inuendo* leaves a permanent impression on the minds of those who are at

all affected by it, without, in general, presenting any thing sufficiently definite to be refuted. Controversial dexterity may thus be proved; and the Bishop has given abundant proof of it: but does truth require or approve of such defence?*

* I might quote numerous instances of this system of indirect insinuation; but I must content myself with adverting to two instances respecting Dr. Priestley.

After citing a splendid encomium on Dr. Priestley, from Dr. Parr's *Letter to the Inhabitants of Eleutheropolis*, communicated by "a friend, of the highest literary distinction and moral worth," together with that friend's delineation of what he deems features in his character, which, with some qualifications, may be admitted to be such, Dr. Magee says that he considers "the bright parts of the character to have been too highly emblazoned by Dr. Parr, the darker spots to have been too sparingly touched by" his "much valued correspondent, and some important points to have been entirely overlooked by both." *Disc. and Diss.* vol. ii. p. 422 [376]. What those "important points" are, the Reader is left to conjecture; but the general strain of the Bishop's invectives, leads us to suppose that he refers to *piety* and *humility*.

Tried by a just standard, I am persuaded that the character of Dr. Priestley will bear strict examination in the latter respect. "No person (as he says himself) can be justly blamed for entertaining a *just* idea of his own character and worth. Without this, no person, whether he speaks of it or not, which can make no real difference can act up to his character." (*Notes on Scripture*, vol. iii. p. 169.) But that he highly appreciated the value of genuine humility, will appear from the following passages, among many which might be cited. "We may assure ourselves, that there is no virtue more properly Christian than this of *humility*, and a readiness to consult the honour and happiness of other persons." "The surest criterion of our advancing in real excellence and perfection of character, is our acquiring a disposition to think less of ourselves, and of our happiness, and more of that of others" (p. 419). "No sentiment whatever is so favourable to every thing

The first instance (vol. i. p. 196) to which his Index directs us, of Dr. Priestley's mode of evading

amiable, good, and great, in the heart of man, as a spirit of *deep humility*, grounded on disclaiming all our excellencies, and referring them to their proper source,—that feeling which Dr. Hartley very expressively calls *self-annihilation*, joined with that which naturally and necessarily accompanies it, *joy and confidence in God as working all our good works in us and for us*. This is the disposition that inspires all the Writers of the books of Scripture : and is observable in all truly serious and devout persons to this day, whether their speculative opinions be favourable to it or not." (*Illustrations*, §. 11. *Works*, vol. iii. p. 522.) Perhaps there is no indication of genuine humility more striking than a ready disposition to forgive injuries : and even Bishop Magee could not deny our Christian philosopher this characteristic, if he would carefully peruse his *Discourse intended to be delivered soon after the Riots in Birmingham*.

With respect to Dr. Priestley's *piety*, I appeal, with full confidence, to all who understand the genuine characters of that exalted principle, as displayed in the precepts and spirit of Christ and his Apostles, and who have thoughtfully perused his practical works, (in which the *man* is most distinctly discernible;) and I maintain, that he was one who acknowledged God in all his ways, and that devotion was the habitual characteristic of his heart. Those who only know Dr. Priestley as a controversialist, I refer to his invaluable *Discourses on Habitual Devotion* and the *Duty of not living to ourselves*. Few persons, I conceive, possessed of any religious principle, could read them without becoming wiser and better.

In vol. ii. p. 433 [387], Dr. Magee says that Dr. Priestley " **DELIBERATELY** advised Mr. Lindsey to retain his preferments in " the Church, *at the same time that he laboured to undermine its* " *creeds* ; an advice, however, which the Rector of Catterick was " too honest to comply with." Three pages before, speaking of Mr. Belsham and Dr. Priestley, he says, and with solid reason, " *I believe them BOTH to be INCAPABLE of DUPLICITY.*" And yet he

Scripture authority, might be cited as an illustration of the above remarks. He there gives his readers a *continued quotation* from *Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 252; in which, by a skilful omission or two, and substituting an abridgment instead of the Author's own words, he has contrived to render the impression of the whole, more unfavourable to Dr. Priestley than what the original passage could have given. And he also represents Dr. Priestley as maintaining that Christ is not connected with our salvation in any sense, which he knew was absolutely without foundation; and the Reader may know it too, by referring

charges Dr. Priestley with advising a breach of 'simplicity and godly sincerity,' which he could not doubt that Dr. Priestley would not have practised in Mr. Lindsey's place. Dr. Priestley certainly gave Mr. Lindsey advice, which he himself condemns; but, as stated by himself, (and but for his own information we should never have known it,) it has a widely different complexion from what Dr. Magee gives it. Mr. Lindsey, at the time referred to, was not labouring to undermine its creeds; and the only question was, ought he to remain in the Church, when he could not conscientiously conduct its public services as it enjoins them. Speaking with great delight of his first introduction to Mr. Lindsey, Dr. Priestley says (*Life*, p. 68, or *Life of Lindsey*, p. 36), "He soon
 "discovered to me that he was uneasy in his situation, and had
 "thoughts of quitting it. At first I was not forward to encourage
 "him in it, but rather advised him to make what alteration he
 "thought proper in the offices of the Church, and leave it to his
 "superiors to dismiss him if they chose. But his better judgment
 "and greater fortitude led him to give up all connection with
 "the Established Church, of his own accord." So much for Dr. Priestley's *deliberate advice*. If Dr. Magee had given his Readers Dr. Priestley's own statement, his ungenerous insinuation would have lost all its pungency. He has not even given them any means of knowing where to find the truth.

to the extract in p. 148, as well as to other passages which I have quoted in this volume.

In another instance referred to (vol. i. p. 247), by closing his quotation (from *Hist. of Cor.* vol. i. p. 199. 2d ed. p. 188) in the very place where he ought not to have closed it,—in the middle of a sentence, and where Dr. Priestley was explaining and justifying his preceding assertion,—the Bishop has prevented the fact from appearing, that Dr. Priestley was referring to a doctrine very different from what he represents him as combating, (viz. that God “required the death of Christ, in order to satisfy his justice for our sins, and as a necessary means of his forgiving us ;”) and that it is not *in opposition* to Scripture evidence, but *for want* of Scripture evidence, that Dr. Priestley maintains that it is not a doctrine of Revelation. It is somewhat remarkable, that Bishop Magee accords with Dr. Priestley in rejecting this doctrine. In the opinion of the Satisfactionist, therefore, he, too, must be regarded as evading the force of Scripture authority.

In the Twenty-seventh Dissertation, “On the Texts describing Christ’s Death as a Sacrifice for Sin,” the Bishop adduces (p. 223) what he calls “an instance of the most expeditious and effectual method of evading the authority of Scripture; and this must be considered a little more at large.

The Dissertation begins with the citation of twenty-two passages, all (with the exception of Is. liii. 5—8) in the New Testament; “all which,” says Dr. Magee, “and several other passages,” (which, however, he does not specify,) “speak of the death

“ of Christ in the same sacrificial terms that had
 “ been applied to the sin-offerings of old.” He soon
 after tells us that Dr. Priestley, though he “ pro-
 “ fesses (*Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 125) to collect ‘ ALL
 “ ‘ the texts, in which Christ is represented as a
 “ ‘ sacrifice, either expressly or by plain reference,’
 “ has not been able to find so many to his pur-
 “ pose, as have been here referred to.” And yet
 Dr. Priestley has mentioned some which the Bishop
 has not cited ; and so far from making the professions
 assigned to him, he only says, “ all the texts *in which*
I have found Christ represented as a sacrifice ;” and
 in the very next page he says, “ making allowance for
 a few that I may have overlooked.”

But this is the least of my objections to the Bishop's
 representation of the matter. Dr. Priestley not only
 refers to the passages, but quotes the leading ones at
 length : Dr. Magee, on a point so important, is satisfied
 with specifying the texts ; and by the aid of his “ seve-
 ral other passages,” he musters an apparent body of
 evidence, which, if relevant, might have great weight
 in the controversy. As in many other of Dr. Magee's
 strong reasons, however, it requires only examination
 to show, either that he does not understand the real
 bearings of the subject, or that he allows himself
 arts, which the honourable ingenuousness and Chris-
 tian simplicity of the Author whom he opposes, would
 on no account have permitted him to employ. Some-
 times the fact appears a compound of both. In the
 present instance, the state of the case is remarkable.
 Out of his twenty-two passages, considerably above
 half *do not* “ speak of the death of Christ in the same

trifling terms, that had been applied to the sin-
 derings of old ;”* and by this specimen the Reader
 may form some judgment, not only as to the contro-
 versial ignorance, or disingenuousness, of this cele-
 brated polemic, but of the caution with which he
 could follow him as an expounder of Scripture, even
 when citing Scripture itself.

So far is Dr. Priestley from omitting passages
 which closely bear on the subject, that he has brought
 forward every one cited by Bishop Magee which is
 at all relevant, as well as some which he has not
 cited: and thus it is, that for want of that exami-
 nation which few would deem necessary, Dr. Magee
 has been supposed to have carried every thing be-
 fore him.

The Dissertator then quotes, &c., from Dr. Priest-
 ley; and by the help of little changes in his words,
 and of additions, the import of which the superficial

* The passages enumerated in *Diss.* xxvii., “On the Texts
 ascribing Christ’s Death as a SACRIFICE FOR SIN,” which are
 completely irrelevant, are the following: Matt. xx. 28; xxvi. 28.
 Mark x. 45. Acts viii. 32, 33. Rom. iii. 24, 25; iv. 25; v. 6—10.
 Cor. v. 7; xv. 3. Eph. i. 7. Col. i. 14. 1 Tim. ii. 6. Heb. ii. 17.
 The other passages cited by Dr. Magee are, Is. liii. 5—8. 2 Cor. v.
 14. * Heb. i. 3; ix. 12—28; x. 10, 14, 18. 1 Pet. i. 18, 19.*
 John iv. 10. Rev. v. 9—12; * xii. 8. Of these, the texts which
 are followed by an asterisk appear to me irrelevant.

The Bishop’s assertions on this point, (as will appear when we
 have examined the various passages which he has adduced,) are
 mere words,—*inopes rerum, nugæque canoræ*.

If the Reader doubt the correctness of my arrangement of Dr.
 Magee’s scriptural testimonies, I must request him to suspend a de-
 cision against me, till he have considered my reasons. See Part II.

reader will readily attribute to the Unitarian, he contrives to give an impression to his argument, which no discriminating candid mind could have derived from Dr. Priestley's own words. They are as follows :

“ Upon this collection of texts* it is obvious to remark, that (making allowance for a few that I may have overlooked) far the greater part of them are from one epistle, which is allowed, in other respects, to abound with the strongest figures, metaphors, and allegories ; and the rest are too few to bear the very great stress that has been laid upon them, and the view they exhibit of the death of Christ. Besides, the manner in which this idea is introduced in these texts, which is only indirectly, and often exactly in the style of figurative allusion, intimates plainly enough that a few circumstances of resemblance are sufficient for that purpose. Had the writer really considered the death of Christ as the intended antetype of the sacrifices under the law ; had this been the great and principal end of his death, it would have been asserted in the fullest and plainest manner, and references to it would have been much more frequent than they are.” *Theol. Rep.* vol. i. p. 126.

On this reasoning the Bishop of Raphoe makes the following remarks :

“ We are here furnished with an instance, of the most expeditious, and effectual method, of evading the authority of

* The Texts quoted by Dr. Priestley (p. 125) are the following: John i. 29. Eph. v. 2. Hebr. vii. 27. 1 Pet. i. 2, 19. 1 John ii. 2 ; iv. 10. Rev. v. 6, 9. After Hebr. vii. 27, Dr. P. says, “ The same idea occurs, chap. viii. 3 ; ix. 12, 26 ; x. 10, 12, 14, 19 ; xii. 24 ; xiii. 12 ; and it is necessary to have a view to it, in order to understand all that part of the Epistle.” He afterwards (p. 126) refers to Is. liii. 10, and 2 Cor. vi. 21 ; but he endeavours to show that these are irrelevant.

cripture.—First, overlook a considerable majority, and particularly of the strongest texts, that go to support the doctrine you oppose : in the next place assert, that of the remainder, a large proportion belongs to a particular writer, whom you think proper to charge with metaphor, allegory, &c. &c. : then object to the residue, as too few on which to rest any doctrine of importance : but lest even these might give some trouble in the examination, explode them at once with the cry of figure, &c. &c.—This is the treatment, that Scripture too frequently receives, from those who choose to call themselves rational and enlightened Commentators.” *Disc. and Diss.* vol. i. p. 223.

If Dr. Priestley’s statements deserved all this tirade, let its bitterness rest on them : but one thing I say, that the implied charge, that Dr. Priestley overlooked “a considerable majority, and particularly of the strongest texts” supporting the doctrine he opposed, is absolutely false.

We have Divine Revelation “in earthen vessels.” Even supposing, what few will now maintain, the constant plenary inspiration of the Apostles and Evangelists, yet human language is variable ; and, unless miraculous aid had been afforded to transcribers and translators, what case can be imagined, in which any doctrine could be admitted, on the strength of a single passage of Scripture, to be a doctrine of Revelation, if it were *clearly and directly opposed* to the analogies of nature, and the principles of justice and benevolence which the Author of nature has implanted within us, more especially if at the same time inconsistent with the plain and express and repeated declarations of Revelation ? What evidence, indeed, could then be

sufficient to establish it?—Take a case having no doctrinal aspect. The Gospel by St. Matthew informs us that our Lord said, ‘I come not to send peace but a sword.’ Here the “*plain and obvious meaning*” is, that the object of our Lord’s mission was, not peace and good-will towards men, but discord and destruction. Now, if there certainly were no other way in which the words could justly be interpreted, who would hesitate in believing, that the Sacred Historian did not record the words of our Lord, as we find them; or even, were there no other alternative, that he had incorrectly recorded our Lord’s words?

This is the principle of reasoning on which Dr. Priestley has, in various instances, proceeded; and though in some instances he has expressed himself very unguardedly in the application of it, I can see no fallacy in the principle itself.

I have heretofore stated, that the principles of verbal criticism were less thoroughly and less generally understood, when Dr. Priestley began his theological career, than at present. There are few instances of importance, in which we cannot now satisfactorily ascertain what were the original words of the Apostles and Evangelists. And believing the evidence (both historical and internal) for the

* Luther said that “he would not hear sense, or reason, when God had spoken.” (*Beausobre’s History of the Reformation*, vol. iv. p. 148, quoted by Dr. Priestley, in his *Defences*, for 1787, p. 56.) Luther was quite right, provided he had satisfactory proof that “God had spoken;” but to my mind nothing is more evident, than that what certainly is *contrary* to sense and reason, certainly could not be from God.

genuineness of their writings, to be fully satisfactory, I should prefer, on all occasions, while I derive my views of Revelation from the general tenor and express declarations of Scripture, to rest satisfied under any *apparent* inconsistencies, with the conviction, that, as in the book of Providence, so in the book of Revelation, every thing that is dark will some time or other be illumined. But were it *necessary* to believe a position so inconsistent as the one above cited is, in its plain and obvious meaning, with the character of God and the fully ascertained objects of the Gospel, to be a doctrine of Revelation, or else to give up the genuineness of the passage or even of the book in which it is contained,—or, being compelled by evidence to admit the *genuineness* of the record, to give up the *authenticity* of it,—who could doubt which part of the alternative to adopt?

I have dwelt upon this view of the subject, because it really seems to be lost sight of by the opponents of Unitarianism; and yet I see not how it can be proved to be erroneous. The principle appears to me to be undeniable: nevertheless, the prudence of piety and benevolence will make a person very careful in the application of it, for the sake of others, if not for his own. The needless and injudicious use it, led the late upright and learned Mr. Evanson, among others, to conclusions which I regard as utterly untenable and baneful.

The opponents of Unitarianism run into the opposite extreme. Habituated to consider the sacred records as in every part proceeding from the finger

of God, (or at least to entertain that species of reverence for them, which, directly or indirectly, has been derived from that opinion,) and thence proceeding to attribute to prevalent *interpretations* of Scripture, the sacredness which belongs only to the original, they endeavour, by metaphysical theories, to harmonize these interpretations with the plain teachings of Revelation and of the ordinary ways and works of God. They go farther, and they invest these metaphysical theories with the sacredness and authority of Revelation itself; though Revelation knows nothing of them, and, as far as they assume a definite tangible form, directly opposes them.

Revelation never can require any subtle hypotheses of human invention, to connect and harmonize its several parts.

Some of those who regard Unitarianism with unfeigned alarm, (because they see it only through the mists with which even its friends, but much more its enemies, have sometimes enveloped it,) abandon the metaphysical explanations of popular doctrines, but satisfy themselves with interpretations of different parts that are really contradictory, from a conviction that the Scriptures teach both, and that humility and faith require to believe them. Their humility and faith are truly commendable; but they surely never can consider, that He who is Light, and in whom there is no darkness at all, could not have intended that the pious humble understanding should be involved in mystery and contradiction, and its noblest exercises altogether interrupted, by a *revelation* through one who, speaking with the authority of

Son, uttered those impressive words, ‘ I am the light of the world ; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.’ If the Gospel dispensation were as full of perplexity and mystery as many make it, there must indeed be a preparation of the understanding before it could be received. I rejoice in the conviction, that Christianity finds, in a well-regulated understanding united with a pious heart, its most faithful ally.

When the true reading of any passage is undisputed, or has been established by satisfactory evidence, the wisest course certainly is, to rest satisfied with the conviction, that any inconsistencies which may appear to have with the general tenor and explicit teachings of Holy Writ, will prove to be in appearance only ; and to found our faith, not on what is obscure and difficult, but upon those express and repeated declarations, which bear the *characters* of REVELATION, and which accord with the best notions we can form of the dealings and dispensations of the all-just, all-holy, ever-blessed Author of it, of HIM who is LIGHT and who is LOVE.

It may be admitted that Dr. Priestley, in the ardour of a mind which has gained its spiritual freedom, sometimes proceeded beyond the limits of sound caution. On the other hand, many of those who opposed him, altogether lost sight of the fact, that *they* were not infallibly right in attributing to the *present records* of revelation, and still less to *their own interpretations* of these records, all the authority and certainty which revelation itself must possess. Hence they rashly concluded, that he who rejected their interpretations

and theories, slighted the divine authority ; and the charges of pride, and presumption, and irreverence, and even of impious blasphemy, were liberally poured down on one whose excellencies they could not appreciate, because they fancied that all excellence depended upon a strict conformity to their own narrow opinions.

That among those whose opinions Dr. Priestley laboured, by argument and evidence, to overthrow, (with a cheering confidence that in so doing he was promoting the glory of God,) many had the same fearless and disinterested love of truth with himself, is cheerfully allowed ; but it must not be forgotten, that if they thought he was treating with irreverence the records of Revelation, because he interpreted them on different principles from theirs, he considered them as (unintentionally but effectively) involving the great truths of Revelation and the dealings of our Heavenly Father, in more than Egyptian darkness. If they thought he dishonoured the Scriptures, he thought they dishonoured God. But in one respect he had a great moral advantage over them : he was ever ready to consider their errors as the errors of the understanding, and the prepossessions of early education ; while his opponents too commonly attributed his to the disorders of the heart.

I am not prepared to accord with Dr. Priestley in all his implied or avowed canons of criticism ; nor to defend all his modes of expression : but I am sure that his writings afford abundance of proof, that a serious regard and high value for the Scriptures, a

ep habitual reverence for that Great Being with whom we have to do, a cordial attachment to the cause of Christ and the best interests of mankind, and a sincere and intrepid love of truth, were constant ruling principles in his mind. And I maintain, therefore, that Christian equity *demands*, that if a few unguarded expressions, arising from the haste and warmth of controversy or the ardour of investigation, are to receive the severe and abusive condemnation which is so unmercifully passed upon them, they should be taken in their connection, and considered in relation to those qualities which his writings, even the most controversial, indisputably display.

I might easily fill my volume with extracts which would convince the open-hearted Reader, that my estimate of Dr. Priestley's zealous attachment to divine Revelation, and to the Scriptures as containing that Revelation, is no less just than it is high-raised: but I must content myself with a few specimens. If these contribute to lead the intelligent inquirer to a better acquaintance with his works, the result can scarcely fail to be a decided conviction that Dr. Magee has repeatedly violated the simplest principles of controversial and even common equity; and if he should not be led by Dr. Priestley's arguments to imbibe his religious sentiments, his appreciation of Dr. Priestley's character will be heightened, his own mind will be expanded and invigorated, his views respecting the providence and attributes of God will be enlarged, and his best sentiments of religious

principle and benevolence will be excited, strengthened, and refined.

My first extract shall be from an inestimable volume of *Discourses* (1787), which I hope, for the credit of Dr. Magee's veracity, that this virulent opponent of Unitarianism has never seen. It contains those Sermons (see p. 213) which, most deservedly, have been very extensively circulated among Unitarians, as calculated to promote the knowledge and practice of Christian duty ; and the whole breathes a spirit of enlightened steady elevated piety and Christian principle, which must convey to all but the narrow-minded bigot, an impression favourable to the religious character of the Author. Those who have studied the elements of mental philosophy in the same school, will also perceive, how eminently subservient that branch of science is to the science of religion, to which alone it can yield in utility. If the Bishop of Raphoe possess that Christian spirit which he has somewhere well delineated, though he has too seldom exemplified it in his writings, the perusal of the volume I refer to, may make him deeply regret that he has allowed himself such unwarrantable liberties with the character of the Unitarian philosopher. The same exercise might lead to similar feelings, among those who have made an unsparing use, without examination, of Dr. Magee's statements and insinuations.

The volume opens with a Sermon from 1 Pet. i. 13, on a Serious Attention to Religious Duties, which was delivered, in the year 1773, on relinquishing the pastoral charge at Mill-Hill Chapel, Leeds. I extract

the following passage from it, on the value of the Scriptures.

“ A man, therefore, who means to be a Christian in earnest, must, in a more especial manner, make himself acquainted with the books of *Scripture*, and meditate upon their contents ; because these books, and these books alone, contain the proper materials for this excellent and necessary *discipline of the mind*, viz. a genuine view of the principles of Christian faith, hope, and practice.

“ It is in these books only that we have an authentic account of the several dispensations of God to mankind. Here we have the original instructions of men sent of God, that is, of God himself, respecting our conduct here, and our expectations hereafter. Here we meet with a distinct account of the lives of the prophets, and especially of the great prophet of God, Jesus Christ, by whose miracles, death, and resurrection, all the promises of God are confirmed to us. In these books also we see, and are thereby made to *participate* of, the genuine effects of religious principles on the hearts of men, in the piety and benevolence with which the sacred writers were apparently [evidently] actuated ; so that we enter into their excellent sentiments, as well as view their exemplary lives.

“ If, my brethren, we would consult our real improvement and happiness, as Christians, we must be sensible that we cannot be too minutely acquainted with such particulars as these, or meditate too much upon them. No other exercise can be efficacious to form the heart and guide the life. We therefore find the greatest stress laid upon this employment in the books of *Scripture*.”

Dr. Priestley then quotes, or refers to Deut. vi. 6 ; Ps. i. 1 ; xix. 7, &c. cxix. 97, and 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16 ; and then proceeds :

“ These injunctions and exhortations certainly authorize us to conclude, that the frequent reading of the Scriptures, the taking pleasure in them, and meditation upon their

principle and benevolence will be excited, strengthened, and refined.

My first extract shall be from an inestimable volume of *Discourses* (1787), which I hope, for the credit of Dr. Magee's veracity, that this virulent opponent of Unitarianism has never seen. It contains those Sermons (see p. 213) which, most deservedly, have been very extensively circulated among Unitarians, as calculated to promote the knowledge and practice of Christian duty; and the whole breathes a spirit of enlightened steady elevated piety and Christian principle, which must convey to all but the narrow-minded bigot, an impression favourable to the religious character of the Author. Those who have studied the elements of mental philosophy in the same school, will also perceive, how eminently subservient that branch of science is to the science of religion, to which alone it can yield in utility. If the Bishop of Raphoe possess that Christian spirit which he has somewhere well delineated, though he has too seldom exemplified it in his writings, the perusal of the volume I refer to, may make him deeply regret that he has allowed himself such unwarrantable liberties with the character of the Unitarian philosopher. The same exercise might lead to similar feelings, among those who have made an unsparing use, without examination, of Dr. Magee's statements and insinuations.

The volume opens with a Sermon from 1 Pet. i. 13, on a Serious Attention to Religious Duties, which was delivered, in the year 1773, on relinquishing the pastoral charge at Mill-Hill Chapel, Leeds. I extract

the following passage from it, on the value of the Scriptures.

“ A man, therefore, who means to be a Christian in earnest, must, in a more especial manner, make himself acquainted with the books of *Scripture*, and meditate upon their contents ; because these books, and these books alone, contain the proper materials for this excellent and necessary *discipline of the mind*, viz. a genuine view of the principles of Christian faith, hope, and practice.

“ It is in these books only that we have an authentic account of the several dispensations of God to mankind. Here we have the original instructions of men sent of God, that is, of God himself, respecting our conduct here, and our expectations hereafter. Here we meet with a distinct account of the lives of the prophets, and especially of the great prophet of God, Jesus Christ, by whose miracles, death, and resurrection, all the promises of God are confirmed to us. In these books also we see, and are thereby made to *participate* of, the genuine effects of religious principles on the hearts of men, in the piety and benevolence with which the sacred writers were apparently [evidently] actuated ; so that we enter into their excellent sentiments, as well as view their exemplary lives.

“ If, my brethren, we would consult our real improvement and happiness, as Christians, we must be sensible that we cannot be too minutely acquainted with such particulars as these, or meditate too much upon them. No other exercise can be efficacious to form the heart and guide the life. We therefore find the greatest stress laid upon this employment in the books of *Scripture*.”

Dr. Priestley then quotes, or refers to Deut. vi. 6 ; Ps. i. 1 ; xix. 7, &c. cxix. 97, and 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16 ; and then proceeds :

“ These injunctions and exhortations certainly authorize us to conclude, that the frequent reading of the Scriptures, the taking pleasure in them, and meditation upon their

contents, are absolutely necessary. in order to *gird up the loins of our minds*, and to form a truly Christian character and conduct. The Scriptures will not be neglected by any person, but in consequence of his not apprehending himself to be sufficiently interested in their contents; and without this apprehension it is impossible that truly religious principles can be implanted, and take root in the mind. Without this aid, the temptations of the world will be too strong for a man. He will not be sufficiently upon his guard, so as to have the perfect command of himself, and not be surprized into improper sentiments and unworthy actions.

“ I mention a constant attention to the Scriptures, not as the only means of girding up the loins of our minds, and strengthening religious principles, but as that which is of eminent use to recommend and enforce the rest, such as prayer, an attendance upon public worship, and other means of religion. All these things have a natural connection, and they introduce and assist one another.”—*Priestley's Discourses*, (1787) p. 21—24.

In a still earlier production, his *Letter to the Rev. Mr. Venn* (1769), annexed to a most judicious and interesting tract, which is probably but little read at present, on Differences of Opinion among Christians, the following passage occurs, to which I have already referred (p. 87), and to which I beg the Reader's attention, as corresponding, in point of time, to the earlier volumes of the *Theological Repository*.

“ By the way, I would advise you, Sir, not to be so very ready, upon every occasion, to *burn your Bible*. You have a great deal to learn from it yet. For my own part, notwithstanding that you suppose I hold it very cheap, I could, with pleasure, spend the remainder of my life in the study of it, as the only rule of faith and manners.

In many other parts of your book, you make the sameunge and awkward proposals of renouncing you Bible (as a p of *impious nonsense*, p. 20) and your Christianity, if my nions be true ; and (firmly persuaded as I am that they true, and founded on truths revealed in those scriptures, authority of which you risk so lightly) I cannot help being cked at such expressions. They certainly show that you *fully persuaded in your own mind*, and this I suppose is the purpose they were intended to answer. I also am, apas, as fully persuaded in my own mind as you are ; yet ould not choose to make use of such a method of expres- ; it. I do not think it *decent*, or consistent with the reve- ce with which we ought always to speak of those sacred ks. Cannot you find something of less value than the *iptures* and *Christianity*, to pledge upon the truth of your nions ?"—*Letter to the Rev. Mr. Venn*, annexed to the *nsiderations*, p. 48.

In his masterly and inestimable *Letters to a Philo- hical Unbeliever* (1787), he speaks of the " satis- tion and advantage " which the person habitually periences in reading the Scriptures, " who has been educated a Christian, and been brought up with a reverence for those sacred books ;" and I might tract some passages from it ; but we will go on to his scourses (1794) relating to the *Evidences of Divine elation*, which contain probably the best state- ent extant of the evidence for the divine authority the Mosaic dispensation. We there see the same gh estimate of the value of the Scriptures running oughout. His first Discourse, on the Importance Religion to enlarge the Mind of Man, shows the ple comprehensiveness of his views, and the devo- n of his heart ; and it affords a fine specimen of e manner in which he makes philosophy intelligible

and practical, and, as it ever should be, subservient to the interests of religion. One passage I will cite, as closely connected with my present object.

“ If these be the true sources of that comprehension of mind, which gives one man a superiority over another,—if, as is commonly and justly said, it be *great thoughts* that *make great minds*, little cause has the poor Christian to envy even the most enlightened, and still less scholars in general, who are not Christians. The study of the Scriptures alone, contributes so much to this great end, that all that learning can do more is a mere trifle, and without it infinitely little.

“ All the greater virtues, such as patience in suffering, forgiveness of injuries, general benevolence, and habitual devotion, imply great comprehension of mind, or a union of more ideas and impressions than the present moment would furnish: but with them the mind of a Christian is already furnished; and therefore those sublime virtues are easily acquired by a Christian, and not easily, if at all, by those who are not Christians.”—*Discourses on Revelation*, vol. i. p. 13, 14.

These Discourses were continued in Philadelphia (1797); and in various parts of the second and third volumes, similar sentiments are distinctly discernible. Near the close of the former, in a Sermon on the Moral Influence of Christian Principles, Dr. Priestley says,

“ It will be inquired by what means the influence of the world can be counteracted, or by what means a due attention to Christian principles can be best secured. I answer, the principal means to effect this great purpose, and one that will naturally lead to every other, is a familiar acquaintance with the Scriptures. The zealous Christian will make these books his constant companions. With the pious Psalmist, (Psalm i. 2,) *his delight will be in the law of the Lord, and in his law will he meditate, day and night.*

— Such views of things as these, which will be perpetually suggested by the reading of the Scriptures, have the best tendency to ennoble and enlarge the mind, to raise our thoughts and affections above the low pursuits which wholly occupy and distract the minds of the bulk of mankind; they inspire a most delightful serenity in the midst of the cares and troubles of life, and impart a joy which the world can never give nor take away.

By the frequent reading of the Scriptures we shall be unavoidably led to the exercises of meditation, constant watchfulness, and prayer, and every other means of virtuous improvement, whatever has any tendency to repress what is vicious and defective, and promote what is most excellent in human character.”—*Discourses on Revelation*, vol. ii. p. 373.

might extract similar passages from the posthumous Sermon on the Duty of Mutual Exhortation (which may be justly regarded as containing his Last Thoughts); in which he strongly urges the habitual use of the Scriptures; and, in particular, by such means as are fitted to influence persons who, through the multiplicity of other books, had neglected “the reading of that which is of infinitely more value than all the rest.” Indeed he goes so far as to say,

So strongly is my mind impressed with a sense of the importance of the habitual reading of the Scriptures, both from considering the nature of the thing, and from the best attention I have been able to give to particular characters and facts, I do not see how those persons who neglect it, and who find no satisfaction in habitually meditating on the infinitely important subjects to which they relate, can be said to have anything of Christianity besides the name.”—*Four Discourses* 1) annexed to the *Memoirs of Dr. Priestley*, 8vo.

These extracts (which might easily have been made ten times more copious) I have adduced as evidence, for the satisfaction of the candid but uninformed Reader, of the truth of my assertions respecting the high estimation in which Dr. Priestley held the sacred Scriptures; and I am not without the hope, that the judicious observations which I have selected, may operate in the minds of some, to excite to a closer application to the study of the Bible.

The principles which Dr. Priestley inculcated upon others, he habitually practised himself. His familiar and intimate acquaintance with the Scriptures is manifest in all his writings, both controversial and practical. In the *Memoirs of his Life*, written (as far as 1795) by himself, we see how that familiarity was acquired; and we find that he continued the constant perusal of the Scriptures till the very last. From the affecting account which his son has given in the *Memoirs*, of the tranquil peaceful end of this eminent Christian, it appears that on the Friday before his death, (which took place on Monday, Feb. 6, 1804,) he was thus engaged. "He sat up a good part of the day, reading Newcome" (the excellent Primate's Translation of the New Testament), "Dr. Disney's Translation of the Psalms, and some chapters in the Greek Testament, which was his daily practice. He corrected a proof-sheet of the Notes on Isaiah. When he went to bed he was not so well: he had an idea that he should not live another day. At prayer-time he wished to have the children kneel by his bed-side, saying, it gave him great pleasure to see the little things kneel; and,

thinking he possibly might not see them again, he gave them his blessing."

How strongly he urged the habitual perusal of the Scriptures on others, appears from the passages which I have cited. And, following to the last the same principles, we find him, the day before his death, after his son had read to him, the portion of St. John's Gospel respecting the resurrection of Lazarus, dwelling upon the advantage he had himself derived from reading the Scriptures daily, and advising him to do the same, saying that it would prove to him, as it had done to himself, a source of the purest pleasure.

Were my object different, I should dwell on the peaceful satisfaction which he experienced in the review of his life,—his calm collectedness, which, even till within an hour of his dissolution, enabled him to dictate "clearly and distinctly" the alterations and additions he wished made in some of his works,—his gratitude to that Being, whom, we may truly say, he had *acknowledged in all his ways*,—and his confidence in a happy immortality. But, for the simple and interesting details of his last days, I must refer to the Memoirs, which are accessible, in a cheap form, to every one. And one would willingly believe that Prejudice herself must allow, what *we* know from ample and extensive observation, that the Unitarian's views of Christianity do *not* leave him without the *best supports and comforts* in a dying hour.*

* In Messrs. Bogue and Bennett's *History of the Dissenters*, vol. iv. p. 438, is a melancholy specimen of the effect of bigotry and theological rancour, in perverting the simplest facts. It would appear impossible to contemplate the tranquillity of Christian hope,

“The near approach of death,” (to use his own words, in his *Posthumous Discourses*,) “which at

displayed in the last days of the venerable Priestley, with any other emotions than those of affectionate respect, and the conviction that the Gracious Being whom he had habitually served, was with him as he passed through the dark valley. Yet these persons absolutely say, that “the death-bed of Priestley should be regarded “as pronouncing the damnation of the Socinian creed.”

Their calumnious misrepresentations of this Christian philosopher, received a severe but just exposure in the *Monthly Repository* for 1812, p. 637—641. Even the *Quarterly Review* (for Oct. 1813) reprehends their statements respecting Dr. Priestley's death-bed, as “a wicked misrepresentation of him.” “Bigotry (says the Reviewer) makes as dismal an effect upon the understanding as upon the heart.” Multitudes, however, will regard these malignant effusions of bigotry, as indisputable truth; and form their opinion of Unitarianism and its powerful advocate from them.

One expression in the Memoir, referring to the support which the doctrine of Final Restoration had afforded him “in the most trying circumstances,” has been greatly misunderstood by well-meaning persons, and employed with absurd triumph by his enemies. A Writer in the *Monthly Repository*, (whose papers, with the well-known signature of V. F., frequently enrich that very valuable publication, and bear the strongly marked features of the Author's sound judgment, well-regulated zeal, rational piety, and Christian principle,) refers it, with indisputable correctness, to “the misconduct of a near relation,” which “was the cause of greater distress and sorrow to Dr. Priestley, than any, or than all, of the other events of his life.”—See *Monthly Repository* for 1813, p. 227.

From the Letters of Dr. Priestley, which Mr. Belsham has given us in his *Life of Lindsey*, I must select two passages, which I leave to the Reader's own reflections.

The first is dated July 3, 1802. It is addressed to his aged friend, Mr. Lindsey. “Considering how soon we may hope to meet again, the separation by death should not give us much

best cannot but afford a gloomy prospect to a heathen and an unbeliever, is consequently regarded by him," the Christian, "not as an object of alarm, or despondence, but a source of joy and triumph; so that when he leaves the world, which he believes to be at the call and appointment of him that made him and sent him into it, he can, with the Apostle, sing the triumphant song, 'O Death! where is thy sting? O Grave! where is thy victory?—Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ!'"

Though this Section has extended beyond my first intentions, I cannot deny myself the gratifica-

concern. While we live, we ought to value life, and friendship, especially Christian friendship, as the balm of it. But we have a better life in prospect, and therefore should not regret parting with the worse, provided we have enjoyed it properly, and improved it so as to have ensured the better. Absolute confidence does not become any man, conscious as we all must be of many imperfections, of omissions, if not of commissions. But surely, a general sincere endeavour to do what we apprehend to be our duty, will authorize so much hope as may be the reasonable foundation of joy, with respect to a future state, without being chargeable with arrogance or presumption."—*Life of Lindsey*, p. 439.

My other extract is from a Letter to Mrs. Lindsey, Oct. 16, 1802. "These views, as I take more pleasure than ever in Natural History, contribute much to brighten the evening of my days. But my great resource is the Scriptures, which I have not of a long time passed a single day without reading a portion of, and I am more interested in it continually. I seem now to see it with other eyes, and all other reading is comparatively insipid."—*Ibid.* p. 449.

tion of closing it by the delineation of Dr. Priestley's Priestley's character, from the able pen of one whose mind has rich, and varied, and judicious stores of learning and science, and who will, I trust, at some future period, make them more extensively and permanently useful through the press.

“ Let us hope, that those who could doubt, during his life, the benevolence and purity of his motives, will be convinced by his serenity and confidence in death. Let us hope that those who are least partial to his sentiments, will now cheerfully acknowledge, and admire, his active, unwearied, and unsullied virtues. All will allow that he had splendid talents; and in him splendid talents were uniformly directed by the grandest and noblest views. He had no limited or selfish objects—no desire of accumulating riches; none even of the elegancies of refined and polished society; no eagerness for honours and rewards; no jealousy of fame: to discover and obey the will of God, was his first wish: to attain and communicate those truths which he thought would best promote the happiness of man, was the noble object of his indefatigable labours. The conduct of such a man is not to be judged by the maxims of a vulgar prudence; but examine it with reference to its great object, and it will appear that the means he used were judiciously adapted to his end: for he was eminently successful in the pursuit of what he conceived to be important truth; and most powerfully contributed to its diffusion.*

* On this and another passage in the Discourse, the judicious Author makes the following remark, in the Preface, p. vi.

“ In what I have said of *prudence*, p. 20, 28, I certainly intend nothing derogatory to that mistress and queen of human virtues. I acknowledge that in the management of all the great concerns of the world, in the conduct of the statesman, and even of the divine, when he assumes the character of statesman, prudence is the first and most essential of qualities. I only contend that

“ Justly to appreciate his merits ; to estimate the degree in which he aided the progress of reason ; to ascertain the number and the value of the truths which he added to the sum of human knowledge ; to point out the extent to which he influenced or guided the pursuits of his contemporaries, and impressed his own genius upon the genius of his age—the prerogative and criterion of superior minds—must be the work of some abler hand ; must be left, perhaps, to a distant posterity : for it is only at a distance that objects of great magnitude can be viewed in their just proportions : but it may safely be asserted that he threw upon every subject which he treated, a strong, a clear, and an original, unborrowed light ; that his comprehensive and sagacious mind viewed it at once in all its bearings and relations ; instantly presented it in its

she is not the best of guides, to those whose sole object and pursuit is truth, nor the first of virtues in the estimate of the philosopher. He who is solemnly anxious to ascertain the will of that great Being, on whom rests his whole dependence and every hope, can derive little satisfaction, beyond that of a liberal curiosity, from knowing what it might be prudent for the German Reformers to confess at Augsbourg, for Cranmer to select here, for Henry to establish, or Elizabeth to confirm. And he who, in the retirement of his closet, is examining in politics, or morals, not what is most expedient for this purpose, or for that, but what will most conduce to the ultimate attainable perfection of human institutions and of man, has more need of acuteness, vigour, and intrepidity of mind, than prudence.”

Mr. Corrie closes his Preface with two extracts from Dr. Priestley's writings. The first, containing “ the character of a philosopher,” is given as “ a beautiful and correct delineation of his own,” from the *History of Electricity* (Pref. p. xvii.) : the other is a noble and characteristic passage in the *Dedication* to Dr. Jebb, prefixed to the *Illustrations of Philosophical Necessity*.

The Discourse from which the above quotation is made, is now probably accessible to few of my Readers ; and I anticipate their approbation in giving them the opportunity of seeing it.

just position; seized the most conclusive arguments, and urged them with an ardour and an ingenuous simplicity, the first charm of eloquence, that marked a pure love of truth, and an earnest desire to convince, that he might benefit, his readers. His various talents were most happily united, and always mingled with his virtues. In the works of the Divine, we discover an extent and variety of research, a compass, if I may so express myself, of argument; a fertility and happiness of illustration, derived from the pursuits of the Philosopher; in studying the works of the philosopher, the mind is purified, exalted and refined by the habitual devotion of the Christian; not abruptly and ostentatiously obtruded, but beaming with a perpetual lustre from the whole train of reflection and inquiry. It has been said of some of his writings, that 'to peruse them will make the wisest man wiser, and the best man better;' and this remark, with the necessary modifications, may most justly be applied to the whole mass of his numerous works, and to the whole tenor of his exemplary life.

"Let me be excused for having paid this humble tribute to the memory of a distinguished man, at once the glory of our country, and its shame; and who has now added another imperishable name to those of the illustrious dead."—*Discourse on the Exercise of Private Judgment: by John Corrie.* P. 27—30.

CHAPTER VII.

CONSIDERATION OF SOME OF DR. MAGEE'S
REPRESENTATIONS OF MR. BELSHAM'S
VIEWS AND ARGUMENTS.

THE Bishop of Raphoe's attacks upon Mr. Belsham occupy the Appendix to his Dissertations, and, directly and indirectly, the greater part of his Postscript; and, especially in the latter, they are marked by a spirit of furious bitterness, and by a constant strain of illiberal abuse, which nothing can justify. Even if

Belsham had said all that Dr. Magee says he said, and in the way he represents it, respecting the established Clergy,—and if he had personally applied the whole of it, directly to Dr. Magee himself,—still would he have left him without excuse, in the coarse reflections which he employs, or, at any rate, in the gross misrepresentations of Mr. Belsham's opinions and arguments, of which he is repeatedly guilty.

The Appendix, at the first appearance of the work, was directed solely against Mr. Belsham's *Review*. It is now so directed, that one could doubt that it was the first object of the author to bear down his opponent. The Appendix contains no small portion of polemic acuteness; and it contains several imposing and eloquent passages. Those who had not read the *Review*, would consider Dr. Magee as completely successful; and those who have read it, must allow his skill, if not his justice, in the

manner in which he has detached passages from their connection, constructed from them his most pungent charges, given the most obnoxious appearance to unguarded expressions, and, by apparently trifling alterations, made Mr. Belsham speak a language which he never intended.

As fresh works appeared from the pen of Mr. Belsham, Dr. Magee appears to have been ready to seize with avidity any thing that could be turned against him. In the edition of 1812, he takes a wider range of attack; and from Mr. Belsham's *philosophical* as well as his controversial writings, and also from the Improved Version, he derives additional materials for his vituperative acumen and calumnious insinuations. If the Bishop is right, Mr. Belsham has no discrimination, no talents for investigation, no abilities for scriptural criticism, no reverence for divine authority, no humility, no piety, no principle.

I must not, however, omit to say, that after indulging, throughout his Appendix, in a strain of invective and misrepresentation, which must lead all who rely upon him, to rank Mr. Belsham very low, both as a Man and as a Christian, he thus expresses himself, near the close of it.

“ I have now done with Mr. Belsham; nor should I have directed the attention of the Reader so much to this gentleman's performance, had I known of any other work than the *Review of Mr. Wilberforce's Treatise*, in which the entire system and bearings of the doctrines called Unitarianism, are exhibited with equal brevity, distinctness, and candour. To Mr. B. is certainly due, the praise of an honest and open avowal of his sentiments. And, in his work, as I doubt not in his life, are exhibited strong traits of talent, combined with

able and virtuous feeling. The same freedom with which has treated others, and with which, were he to offer any madversions on these volumes, his pen would be directed towards me, I have not scrupled to use with him. *If I have misrepresented him, it certainly has not been my intention.* His language, I confess, has offended me by its arrogance: and perhaps the feeling which that would naturally excite, may have dictated a mode of reply, not always sufficiently respectful. *If any thing like asperity or sarcasm has escaped me, I wish it to be considered as applied to the cause, and the manner of supporting it, rather than to the Writer himself.** *Disc. and Diss.* vol. ii. p. 488 [411].

I leave it to the logical discrimination of Bishop Magee, to distinguish between the qualities of the *Writer* and his manner of supporting a cause. But to the cause itself, it is light, and life, and love: it respects, as its primary, nay, in some measure, its sole objects, the character, the dispensations, and the worship of that Great Being before whom the secrets of all hearts are open, and at whose tribunal the Bishop, with the object of his charges, and I, who am endeavouring to refute them, must one day appear together. He may raise a cloud which, for a time, and in particular situations, may obscure or even hide the rays of Unitarian Christianity; but the sun of vine truth, which rose in the east, and which burst through some of the thickest gloom at the Reformation, must shine brighter and brighter unto the perfect day. In my view, he could not pass a higher eulogium upon any Unitarian, than he has done upon Mr. Belsham, when he declares (p. 450) that he is “by

* Then follows the passage already quoted in p. 113. “His opinions, &c.

no means unworthy of the cause which he supports." He who supports it faithfully and wisely, is glorifying God through Christ Jesus.

The publication of the *Exposure* (see p. 109) produced a Reply to some of the statements of Dr. Magee respecting the Improved Version, attributed by friends and foes to Mr. Belsham, characterized by the usual excellencies of his energetic pen, but not altogether free from expressions which were uncalled for by the controversy, and scarcely accordant with the dignified urbanity which ever attends him in his personal intercourse.* The Reply to the Exposure, aided probably in its effects by some remarks which occurred in Mr. Belsham's strictures on the Bishop of St. David's, seems to have raised Dr. Magee's indignation to its acme; and the Postscript to his Appendix displays a rancorous feeling of personal hostility, which bears down all the usual restraints of prudence and decorum, and makes him lose sight of the characteristics of the Gentleman, the Divine, and the Christian.†

* I deem no language too severe for the system of attack which Dr. Magee adopted against Mr. Belsham. Had it not proceeded from one to whom the world looked up, it might have been left quietly to the disgust of every candid inquirer. But in repelling it as far as appeared necessary, no allusions need have been made to the *patria* of him who employed it. Indeed I think them peculiarly unhappy in connection with the learned Dissertator; for whatever he may be in the customary intercourses of society, his work manifests none of that fine open-hearted generosity, and that brilliancy of imagination, which usually form a part in the character of his countrymen, in union with what the Englishman is apt to consider a precipitancy of judgment.

† *Proprium humani ingenii est, says the philosophical historian, edisse quem læseris.*

I shall be required to adduce some justification of my censure ; and I give what may be sufficient in the note below.* If more be required, I recommend

* Bishop Magee places Mr. Belsham (*Postscript*, p. 30*) among the “ unhappy blasphemers ” of the majesty of the Son of God ; asks (p. 60) if it be too much to charge him “ with direct and deliberate falsehood ? ” attributes to him (p. 67) “ unfair evasions, uncritical glosses, and unchristian principles ; ” talks (p. 68) of “ a rant, that surely never was equalled before the days of Mr. Belsham,—a rant, that would be to the last degree ludicrous if “ it were not to the last degree shocking ; ” ranks him (p. 87) among “ the unlearned and sophistical critics of the Unitarian School ; ” and asserts (p. 94) that “ Priestley, Lindsey, or Cappe, “ have more weight with him at all times than Peter, Paul, or “ John, and display infinitely a clearer and more unprejudiced “ perception of the truths of revelation.”

Many more passages I might cite, in reference to Mr. Belsham. The Bishop speaks of his “ disingenuous vagueness ” (p. 101), of his “ shameful disingenuousness ” (p. 105), of his “ most incoherent and self-contradictory jumble ” (p. 206), and of his *filching* away the evidence of the divinity of Christ (p. 220). He attributes to Mr. Belsham “ downright and irremediable nonsense ” (p. 251), “ artifice and dishonesty ” (p. 259), “ bad faith, unchecked by learning, and unabashed by shame ” (p. 262), “ miserable stupidity ” (p. 288), and, to crown all, “ *direct violations of known TRUTH* ” (p. 311). The only assertion he has made in his *Postscript*, respecting Mr. Belsham, in which I can cordially unite, is, “ *It is impossible to do him justice,* ” (at least after deriving any impressions from the slanders uttered against him,) “ *by any thing short of the actual perusal of his productions* ” (p. 311). And the “ Students in Divinity ” may, after this recommendation of their Professor, take leave to read Mr. Belsham for themselves ; more especially, as their Theological Guide declares, in the following

* Those who use the 4th edition of the *Discourses*, &c., may find the references of this Note, by adding 464 to the pages here given.

the Reader to take the trouble to do, what few, I should suppose, except Unitarians have done,—read through the *Postscript*.

Though differing from my respected Friend, on some points of importance,—regretting that he has occasionally indulged in a strain of sarcasm and irony, which has sometimes been misapplied, and always tended to rouse against him and his cause feelings inconsistent with the calm inquiry after

page, “ I must quote him, for *I cannot otherwise be believed.*” Many passages which he has cited, misrepresented, and censured, he has *not* quoted ; and I say he *ought* not to be believed without examination.

If the Reader desire to have further grounds for my statements in the text above, he may read the following gross calumny (p. 113), rested on statements directly or principally respecting Mr. Belsham : “ Such is the *abuse of authorities* exercised by Unitarian Writers, *without shame or scruple* : and this too, not merely in the ardour of controversial contest, but with the cool and *DELIBERATE purpose of FALSIFYING the Word of God.*” And if the Reader expect from me any additional proof of the malignant bitterness which too often displays itself in this *Postscript*, I refer him to p. 69, where Dr. Magee says, that the Proem of St. John's Gospel is a “ part of Scripture which, though tortured by the advocates of the Socinian heresy into a hundred different shapes, still haunts them with the reassumption of *that one HATED FORM on which they are terrified to look*, still presents to them *the BLESSED JESUS, the Eternal Son of God, whom they CANNOT BEAR to behold as he is, ' the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.'*” I have never reviewed this wild declamation, without astonishment at least equal to my indignation.

It is from such a Writer, whose pen forgets the common restraints of Christian duty, that multitudes derive *the whole* of their knowledge of Unitarians and Unitarianism. From him we appeal to a higher tribunal.

truth,—and unable to unite with him in some of his too unlimited statements respecting those who oppose the system of Unitarianism,—few can appreciate more highly the luminous perspicuity of his writings, his nervous eloquence, and close and vigorous reasoning. Perhaps in some instances he has been more attentive to the strength and general truth of his statements, than to the precision of their expression ; and has thereby furnished the captious objector with offensive weapons against him. And I am willing to admit, that he appears to have sometimes slighted that cautious attention to minute correctness, which is so seldom found united with capacious views and energetic research. Entertaining the fullest confidence in the justness of the cause which he embraced, after long-continued and conscientious inquiry, in opposition to deeply rooted opinions and strong prepossessions, and disgusted with the arts and violence employed to bear it down and to vilify its defenders, it may be allowed that he has sometimes censured too indiscriminately, and with too unsparing a hand : but before he is severely condemned for this, let the system of illiberal abuse, and, what is vastly worse, of groundless and at least careless misrepresentation, which has so long been directed against him personally, be observed and considered. At any rate, *Ὁ αναμαρτητος πρωτος τον λιθον βαλετω.* *John viii. 7.*

The Bishop of Raphoe is not that individual. In his Appendix, he has very frequently employed the system I condemn. In his Postscript, it appears continually. It is often aimed, especially in the former, at Mr. Belsham's views connected with the philosophy of

the human mind. It would not be difficult to show, that even here Dr. Magee is guilty of glaring misrepresentations: but why, I would ask, is Unitarianism to be attacked through Mr. Belsham's philosophical sentiments? * On this point, however, I have already given my views, (see ch. iii. especially p. 32,) and I will now proceed to some points of more immediate connection with the Unitarian controversy.

* The following specimen of Dr. Magee's citations of Mr. Belsham, will show that the Bishop must not be implicitly relied on, even when he does quote him. In the Appendix, vol. ii. p. 449 [396], he gives an instance of Mr. Belsham's "uncommon powers in definition," and quotes the following from his *Elements* (p. 227). "NATURAL LIBERTY, or, as it is more properly called, PHILOSOPHICAL LIBERTY. is the *power of DOING* an action, or its contrary, all the previous circumstances remaining the same." Thus taking it, and representing VOLITION as included among the *previous circumstances*, he makes Mr. Belsham speak "downright and irremediable nonsense." But Mr. Belsham himself defines *Philosophical Liberty* to be "the power of WILLING to do an action," &c. If Dr. Magee had not made the alteration, he could not have overwhelmed Mr. Belsham with confusion. If the Bishop is acquainted with the subject, I know not how to acquit him of "bad faith:" but I hope he is only chargeable with ignorance in his censure, and carelessness in his quotation.

Respecting that principle of Moral Obligation which Mr. Belsham has employed in the *Elements*, and some positions which he has advanced in that work, I have freely expressed my opinion, in the portion of *Systematic Education on Moral Philosophy* (vol. ii. ch. xvi. xviii.), and, more at large, in the first and third Divisions of the article *PHILOSOPHY Moral*, in Dr. Rees's Cyclopaedia. The views which I have there stated, prevent my feeling complete satisfaction with several modes of expression, and some of the arguments, in the *Review*. But Unitarianism is in no way answerable for Mr. Belsham's opinions on this subject, nor for mine, whichever are erroneous.

SECTION I.

On Bishop Magee's Representations of Mr. Belsham's Religious System, in reference to PRAYER.

With an injustice which is perhaps unrivalled in recent controversy, Dr. Magee asserts that Mr. Belsham “*rejects the notion of PRAYER*, making man as it were independent of his Maker.”* This charge was made in the first edition of the *Discourses and Dissertations*, and it has been repeated in each succeeding edition.—*Disc. and Diss.* vol. ii. p. 408 [362].

Dr. Magee was not obliged, perhaps, to know that, in conducting the religious services of a Christian congregation, Mr. Belsham performs the stated worship of the place, embracing the substance of the Liturgy of the Church of England.† Perhaps, too, he

* In connection with this assertion, Dr. Magee adds, in his note, an interesting and important passage, (which I also admire,) from Dr. Percival's *Father's Instructions*, Part iii. To the productions of this excellent and pious Writer, there are many who owe some of their best impressions in favour of religious and moral principle; and every one who is engaged in the formation of the youthful mind, has reason for a feeling of obligation to him. In Bishop Magee's eulogium upon him, I cordially unite; and it is refreshing to the mind to peruse, in the midst of his abuse of Unitarians, expressions of respectful esteem towards one who proved that the great leading principles of Unitarianism are no obstacle to practical piety, but, on the contrary, cherish it.

† The Liturgy employed in the Chapel in Essex-Street, is

really did not know, that Mr. Belsham has published several prayers delivered on particular occasions,

entitled, *The Book of Common Prayer Reformed, according to the Plan of the late Dr. Samuel Clarke*. The learned Bishop of St. David's declares, in his *Postscript to the Bible, &c.*, p. 24, that, if he is not mistaken, Dr. Clarke's name has, by this title, been *unwarrantably abused*. The Bishop of Raphoe, in his *Postscript*, p. 341 [], refers, with great complacency, to Bishop Burgess's arguments in proof; concluding his paragraph thus: "So much for Dr. Clarke's Socinian tendencies and Socinian Liturgy." No friend of Unitarianism ever declared that Dr. Clarke had such tendencies, or compiled a Socinian Liturgy.

In the course of the same Note, (six pages farther on,) after those declamatory passages quoted above (pp. 52, 53), Bishop Magee continues, "DR. CLARKE'S *Book of Common Prayer*; DR. WATTS'S *Divine and Moral Songs*; the same revised and altered by MRS. TRIMMER; and ARCHBISHOP NEWCOME'S Version of the *New Testament*, are all standing monuments of the truth and fair dealing of modern Unitarianism: and the names of *Newton, Locke, Clarke, and Watts*, illustrious remembrancers of the respect which its professors manifest for the true character of the dead."

In Mr. Belsham's *Letter to the Unitarians in South Wales* (p. 111), he has quoted from *Lindsey's Historical View*, p. 236, ARCHBISHOP HERRING'S approving testimonial of "Dr. Clarke's *Common Prayer Book*." Perhaps the following passage from the *Memoirs of Dr. Samuel Clarke* by the eminently excellent THOMAS EMBLYN, may, in this connection, be interesting as matter of history.

"He [Dr. Clarke] once showed me, that he had been making some emendations in his *Common-prayer* book, and the very last time, I think, I ever saw him, (the *March* before he died,) and in some of our last discourse at parting, he asked me, if he had shewn me what he had been doing in his *Common-prayer*. I said I had just seen it once, he added, that it *should not be lost*. With what design or view he had done it, he never said to me. I suppose by something I cast my eye upon, that one design was to correct

which, if the Lord's Prayer be admitted as the Christian's model of adoration and supplication, will bear a close comparison with the devout effusions of any modern Writer; that those discourses which are before the public, manifest the sentiments of rational, enlarged, and elevated piety; and that in his other writings not solely controversial, striking indications continually occur of that influential religious principle, which, I doubt not, will prove at the final account to have formed a predominant part of his character. Of all this, Bishop Magee might be utterly ignorant; yet surely before he allowed a charge so serious against a Minister of the Gospel, to be repeated, edition after edition, for sixteen years, it became him to be certain that he was not violating the divine precept, 'Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour;' it became him to examine the other works of Mr. Belsham, and ascertain on what basis his charge really rested.

But supposing this degree of ignorance, (of itself, in such a case, marked with high culpability,*) Dr. Magee could not be ignorant that *in the very work* which was the object of his bitter animadversions, Mr. Belsham had said enough to secure him from this ungenerous imputation: he could not but know,

some improper expressions, the meaning whereof might be obscure, and the phrase harsh and uncouth, even where no points of doctrine were concerned. But I hardly suppose he ever finished the work, being so soon after taken from us."—*Emelyn's Works*, vol. ii. p. 494.

* ————— το δε ζητούμενον
'Αλωτον, εκφευγει δε τ'αμελούμενον.

that one of his quotations, *suspended in the middle of a sentence*, would, if he had completed it, have enabled his own Readers to perceive that the imputation is as unjust as it is ungenerous. “ You know ” (says Dr. Magee, quoting from Mr. Belsham) “ what impressions will produce justice, benevolence, &c. “ Expose your mind repeatedly and perseveringly to “ the influence of these impressions, and the affections themselves will gradually rise and insensibly “ improve, &c.” (vol. ii. p. 424.) “ You know ” (says Mr. Belsham himself) “ what impressions will produce justice, benevolence, PIETY, DEVOTION, and “ all other moral virtues. Expose your mind ” &c.

I am of opinion that Mr. Belsham wrote several portions of his *Review* too much as a philosopher merely; and that he blended Unitarianism too closely with the peculiarities of his own philosophical system. It might have been well, too, if in the passage which Dr. Magee has selected for his animadversions,* Mr. Belsham had *specified* the means by which *piety* and *devotion* were to be produced. But, with such a passage before him, (even without any further evidence,) to declare that Mr. Belsham “ REJECTS the notion of prayer,” is a melancholy proof how much the polemical spirit makes a man lose sight of the plainest dictates of truth and justice.

The declaration is made against the individual in whose noble Charge at the Ordination of the Rev. William Field, we find a passage, which I will submit to the Reader. The Charge is founded on

* *Review*, p. 172—175. 3d ed. p. 133—136.

2 Cor. ii. 17. After various important observations suggested by this inspiring delineation of the Apostle's character, we find the following.

“ And oh ! what will be the temper and conduct of that minister who sets God always before him ; who in every action of his life and ministry, doth, as it were, behold the eye of the Supreme Being fixed steadily and invariably upon him for purposes the most interesting, the most awful, and the most encouraging ; to pity, to guide, and to succour under every difficulty ; to aid every generous exertion, and to mark, and frown upon, every wilful neglect of duty. Under such impressions, with what earnest solicitude will a minister prepare for the duties of his office, that he may not in the sight of God speak, or do, any thing unworthy of his character, that he may not offer the sacrifice of fools, nor utter crude and indigested ramblings in the name, and in the presence of God ! With what plainness and freedom, with what fortitude, with what dignity and energy, with what infinite superiority to mean and secular views, with what indifference to human applause, with what unconcern as to personal consequences, will he declare *the whole counsel of God* ; not daring to conceal what he believes to be important, that so he may be *clear of the blood of all men* ! With what diligence will he seek, with what eagerness will he embrace, every opportunity of promoting the great ends of his ministry, instructing the ignorant, reclaiming the vicious, recovering the wanderer to the paths of wisdom and virtue, administering consolation to the afflicted, confirming and establishing the sincere Christian ! How will the apprehension of the divine inspection rouse him to unremitting exertions, whatever difficulties he may meet with, whatever temptations to negligence and supineness, with whatever indifference and neglect his services may be treated, whatever ungrateful treatment he may receive, or how little soever his apparent success may be ! And what a tendency will this persuasion have, to engage the Christian

minister often to lift up his heart in devout aspirations after a divine assistance and blessing, and to ascribe all that is good in himself, and all the success of his ministry, to the favour of the Almighty. Rejoicing in the confidence of having laboured faithfully, abundantly, and successfully, he will humbly and thankfully add, *yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me.*

“ I cannot then, Sir, conclude with a better advice or wish than this, that you would *set the Lord always before you*, and that in the whole course of your ministry, you would *study to approve yourself to God*, to glorify his name, and to accomplish his will.” P. 65.

This was delivered in 1790. If the Reader will turn to the Appendix of Mr. Belsham's *Plea for Infant Baptism*, 1817, he will find two Forms for that service, which, whether or not he is satisfied with the reasoning of the work itself, cannot but affect his mind with sentiments towards the Author, widely different from those which the perusal of Dr. Magee's Appendix must produce, in proportion as the mind relies upon his representations. I cannot deny myself the satisfaction of selecting a few short passages.

“ And oh ! how excellent a religion is that which you thus deliberately avow ; and in the profession of which you may justly glory. It is a religion which enlightens the understanding, which enlarges the comprehension of the mind, which purifies the heart, which governs the thoughts, which consecrates the affections, which dignifies and exalts the character, which inspires firmness and energy of mind, which speaks peace and consolation amidst the vicissitudes of life, which alone can administer hope and comfort in the hour of death, which alone can triumph over the darkness and the terrors of the grave.”—P. 107.

“ I feel a pleasing confidence, that it is quite superfluous for me to expatiate in detail upon the various branches of parental duty. You are well acquainted with them : [you are experienced in the practice of them :] and the tender affection which you bear to your children, your earnest solicitude for their safety, their reputation, and their happiness, will at all times prompt you to exert your best endeavours for their improvement in knowledge, virtue, and piety. Nor need I remind you how much it is your duty, and how indispensably requisite to the success of your virtuous efforts, to ‘ask wisdom from above, from Him who giveth liberally and upbraideth not.’”—P. 117.

“ May they be especially sensible of the great importance of training up their children in the knowledge and the love of God, in the belief of the Christian doctrine, in the practice of Christian virtue, and in the exercise of Christian hope. May they be solicitous to sow those seeds of piety, goodness, and truth, which will in due time produce an abundant harvest of honour, usefulness, and comfort. And do thou, O God ! command thy blessing upon all their virtuous endeavours, and crown their parental and pious labours with success. May all who are now present feel a deep and practical conviction of the truth and importance of the Christian doctrine : may we live in habitual subjection to the precepts, and in cheerful reliance upon the promises, of the Gospel : and when Christ who is our life shall appear, may we also appear with him in glory.”—P. 111.

Those who are acquainted, even if practically only, with the nature of the human affections, well know, that where a principle is equally vigorous, habitual, and efficacious, the expression of it widely differs in different individuals. Some manifest the fervors of benevolent feeling for example ; are alive to its impulses ; and seem to think every one cold-hearted who cannot at once join with them in its promptings.

Others, who, judging by every test by which benevolence can be tried, must be allowed to possess it in its genuine characters, display little of that sensibility which often deludes while it delights.

And the same is the case with the emotions of devotion. In some, they express themselves with an ardour which seems beyond the condition of humanity, and which is usually followed, for a time, by inability to taste its more tranquil delights. In others, the expression of them is solemn and temperate; and, from its calmness, would scarcely appear to those who mistake excitement for devotion, as possessing any claim to the appellation.*

* This is the general character of the Liturgy of the Church of England. I do not wonder at the earnest attachment to it manifested by pious members of the Establishment; nor at their finding its comprehensive petitions for spiritual blessings, and its devotional and penitential sentiments, always interesting; because, (as in the continual use of the Lord's Prayer among ourselves, in our public and domestic devotions,) all that is holy in the aspirations of the heart, all that is devout in its feelings, becomes associated with corresponding expressions which are familiar to it, and these call them up, when no other language and no other mode of worship could have a similar efficacy. Would to God that it were freed from all expressions for which the Bible affords no warrant! If those who direct in such concerns, should wisely remove these stumbling-blocks to the Scripturalist, and be satisfied with a solemn declaration of assent to *the divine authority of the SCRIPTURES, of the Rule of Faith and Duty* instead of that snare to men's consciences, *Subscription to the Thirty-nine articles*, they will do infinitely more for the stability of the Established Church, than by the present injurious system of exclusion from civil rights, and from those avenues to worldly influence and respectability, which ought to be at least open to all.

So again, there are some who are apt to measure piety by the length and frequency of the devout exercises. Others, perceiving these employed pre-udicially, may here go to the opposite extreme, though they themselves possess the genuine principle of religious obedience, and may be truly said, in the best and most extensive sense, to fear the Lord, and, in the midst of imperfection, to do the will of God.

It is not easy for one to judge of another in this respect. He, and He only, who looketh at the heart, can see its secret aspirations after obedience to His will, its secret endeavours to *be* as well as to *do* what He requires. And if the external fruits of a sober and righteous life exist, and no indications present themselves of the absence of reverence and godly

The sentiments of the former part of this Note are forcibly expressed by Mr. Fox, in his recently published *Lectures*, a work marked by energetic thought, comprehensive views, close and vigorous reasoning, powerful appeals to the affections, and brilliant eloquence.

“ Amid these censures,” says Mr. Fox, “ let me render one cordial tribute of praise, and that is to the *Liturgy*. Making, of course, some doctrinal exceptions, that is indeed Christian. Excluding holy writ, it may challenge competition with the devout productions of all countries and ages. It is a simple, pure, and noble composition. From the bottom of my soul do I admire it, and, as far as my private feelings are concerned, know of no fitter form of words for man to hold communion with his Maker in. Probably much of it has descended from a very early age of Christianity. However that may be, it is worthy of the best days of Christianity. Bred a Dissenter, no early associations prompt this praise. It is the dictate of unbiassed conviction, which, in such a discourse as this, to withhold were uncandid and unjust : like my censures, it is honest and heartfelt.”—*Fox's Lectures*, 12mo. p. 47.

fear, it is at least reasonable to presume, that some good portion exists of that devotedness of the soul to God, which is the true effect of genuine devotion, and without which its most splendid and fervent effusions are mere meteors of the feelings or of the imagination.

It is assuredly no part of Mr. Belsham's system, to separate the social and personal virtues from the virtues of piety. In his view, they are all essential branches of Christian morality. He who can read his writings, without perceiving that the principle and affections of piety are most highly appreciated by him, must read with the eye of prejudice. And it may be permitted me to add, that those who can consider his life, without perceiving the manifestations of their genuine influences, must have formed their notions upon models which, if not inconsistent with the principles of the Gospel, are not to be found there.

But were I obliged to admit, (and if truth required it I would admit,) that Mr. Belsham has under-rated the affections of piety, or even its instrumental duties, still should I urge, that Unitarianism is not answerable for this. I will not say that it presents some of those themes for devotional rapture, which are to be found in the writings of our Orthodox brethren : and if this be the criterion of religious truth and excellence, the Catholic has the pre-eminence over the Protestant. But I fearlessly maintain, that there is no scriptural view of God and his dealings to mankind, no scriptural direction and authority for the

exercises of devotion, which Unitarianism does not present and enforce; none to which it presents any hindrance; none which it does not cherish, in their brightest purest influences. And in my estimation it would not be easy to find more decided proofs of real devotion and devotedness of the heart to God, than are manifested by numbers among us, (many of them *educated* in Unitarian principles,) who still live to promote the cause of truth and duty in the world around them. I must not enter into particulars respecting the living; but I exhort the friend of Christian charity, who desires to know what relation Unitarianism has to the religion of the heart and life, to study, in their own writings, the characters of LARDNER, CAPPE, PRIESTLEY, LINDSEY, TOULMIN, &c. &c.

It is happy for the Christian, that piety is displayed, in the sacred Scriptures, under various modifications; and though no fancied attainments in godliness should make him satisfied with himself, it is well that he can turn from modern tests, to the lives of holy men of old, and see those diversities in the manifestation of religious principle, which suit different characters and constitutional temperaments.

WHOSOEVER SHALL DO THE WILL OF MY FATHER WHO IS IN HEAVEN, are the words of the Christian's Lord, THE SAME IS MY BROTHER, AND SISTER, AND MOTHER; and who shall presume to set up another standard of Christian excellence?

SECTION II.

On the Religious Observance of the Lord's Day.

Connected with the subject of the last Section, are Bishop Magee's animadversions on Mr. Belsham's opinions respecting the Lord's day.

He begins his attack in his Second Dissertation, entitled, *Unitarian Objections to the Religious Observance of Stated Days*; and in his Appendix, vol. ii. p. 407 [363], he completes it, in a strain of sarcastic misrepresentation, which, had a Unitarian been guilty of it, would have been quoted and requoted, as *insidious, shamefully disingenuous, &c.*, till it was believed by multitudes, that *Unitarian* was another name for *injurious calumniator*, as well as for *impious blasphemer*.

As we proceed, it will appear that I consider Mr. Belsham's language on this subject as sometimes at least unguarded, and one or more of his positions as unsound: but the Bishop's most poignant strictures are either exaggerated or altogether unjust.

Mr. Belsham certainly does say, in his *Review* (p. 20), "Whatever is *lawful or expedient* upon
" any one day of the week, is, under the Christian
" dispensation, equally *lawful and expedient* on any
" other day;" and as he makes no alteration in his last edition, it may be presumed that he is not dissatisfied with what he had said. The Reader may

sh to have the whole passage before him; and I therefore extract it.

“Christianity sums up the whole of human duty in the love of God and our neighbour: and requiring that *all* our time should be employed to the best account, and that every action should be consecrated to God, lays no stress upon ritual observances, and expressly abolishes that distinction of days which formed so conspicuous a feature in the Mosaic institute. To a true Christian, every day is a sabbath, every place is a temple, and every action of life an act of devotion. A Christian is not required to be more holy, nor permitted to take greater liberties upon one day than upon another. Whatever is lawful or expedient upon any one day of the week is, under the Christian dispensation, equally lawful and expedient on any other day. Public worship, however, must be conducted at stated intervals; and it has been usual from the earliest times for Christians to assemble together, on the first day of the week, to commemorate the death, and to celebrate the resurrection of their Master.”—*Review*, 3d ed. p. 15.

A passage at first sight more objectionable, but in reality much less so, occurs in p. 139.

“Warned by the Apostle, I presume not to condemn any man for his sabbatical observation of the first day of the week. But zealous for the liberty with which Christ hath made us free, and regarding (as the apostle recommends) no man’s censures for not observing the sabbath-day, I have no hesitation in asserting, that under the Christian dispensation ‘every day is alike.’ Of public worship I am a sincere advocate; and having been the uniform practice of the Christian church to assemble for this purpose on the first day of the week, I highly approve of the continuance of this laudable and useful custom. But that under the Christian dispensation one day is more holy than another,* or that any employment, or any amuse-

* “See upon this subject the controversy between Mr. Evanson

ment, which is lawful on other days, is unlawful on the Sunday, can never be proved either from the Christian Scriptures or from ecclesiastical antiquity. Nor is it necessary. The Christian law expressly requires, not that a seventh part only, but that the whole of our time, and every action of life, should be devoted to the service of God, and that, 'whether we eat or drink, or whatever we do, we should do all to his glory.' So that to a true Christian every day is a sabbath, and every employment is an act of devotion."—P. 107.

The difference between the sentiments stated in these quotations is this:—in the latter, there is nothing objectionable to those who do not believe the Jewish sabbatical law to be obligatory on the Christian, provided we take the words *lawful* and *unlawful* in reference merely to the *written Law*; in the former, the word *expedient* gives an extent to the assertion, which makes it, in my judgment, utterly untenable.

I object to the unqualified use of the terms *lawful* and *unlawful* in this restricted sense, which, I presume, must have been Mr. Belsham's meaning; but if, (as the word *expedient* in the first quotation seems to imply,) Mr. Belsham meant by *lawful*, allowed by religious duty (however ascertained), and by *unlawful*, forbidden by religious duty, then I differ from him entirely.

Without the stated discharge of the duties included under the head of public worship, religion would gradually become extinct in society at large, and would be confined within narrow limits in the minds

and Dr. Priestley, where this subject is fully discussed, and brought to a proper issue."

of most men. For the due influence of public worship, it is absolutely necessary that a general suspension of the usual employments and amusements should take place : and whatever interferes with the discharge of those duties, (unless itself required by some more immediately urgent duty,) or naturally tends to destroy the religious impressions which they produce, must be wrong.

To what extent the last restrictive principle is to be carried, no one can judge for another. One may feel it necessary to spend the evening of the Lord's day in his closet : another may find his religious principles and affections best cultivated by engaging in the evening-worship of the house of prayer : another may deem it best to make it the period for the exercise of the family affections, and may encourage that sober cheerfulness which, in the minds of the young, will prevent the seriousness of religion from being mistaken for gloom. One may find social converse best at the close of the day ; and another, a contemplative walk in the solitary grove. He who observes the day with the external precision required by the law of the Jewish sabbath, is right in doing so, if he think this required by the divine command, or find it really necessary for his own religious improvement : but he ought not to condemn others who do not think that the *Christian* has any concern with the fourth commandment, except in the spirit of it, and who regulate the employment of their time by what they think the objects of the day, and by equally extensive views of human duty with himself.

If God had seen fit to continue the obligation of

the sabbatical law under the Christian dispensation, still must it have been interpreted by the principle of our Lord, 'The sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath.' But the spiritual system of the Gospel is not satisfied with external rest and observances. And while it inculcates the great duties of piety, it leaves to every one to determine, according to the diversity of constitution and circumstances, in what precise way, and to what precise extent, the external offices of piety should be exercised.*

The simplest principles of benevolent policy require that there should be a frequent stated cessation from the labours of life; and the spirit of the

* I may here submit to the Reader another passage, which has been introduced in connection with this subject.

"In a true Christian the love of God and devotedness to him, is the governing principle of action. But we cannot always be expressly thinking of God; and a virtuous man is performing his duty to the Supreme Being, as really, and as acceptably, when he is pursuing the proper business of life, or even when enjoying its innocent and decent amusements, as when he is offering direct addresses to him, in the closet, or in the temple."—*Review*, p. 133 [103].

This passage Dr. Magee has cited in proof of his positions against Mr. Belsham, beginning at the words "a virtuous man;" with his usual injustice omitting the views on which Mr. Belsham rests his opinion, or by which they are modified. If the Bishop's *insinuations* are to be regarded, Mr. Belsham's *virtuous man* is one whose devotion consists in the pursuit of the proper business of life, &c. Mr. Belsham clearly means the *true Christian*, in whom *devotedness to God*, (the essence and perfection of religion,) is the *governing principle*. And such a man may so pursue the lawful business, and share in the innocent gratifications of life, as to make even these an acceptable offering to Him who seeth not as man

sabbatical law points out the same thing, and perhaps decides the frequency and extent of such cessation. Whatever interferes with this, unless required by immediate necessity, or really productive of a more general attention to it, I consider as forbidden by benevolent policy. But regarding this cessation as most closely connected with the religious and even mental amelioration of mankind, and particularly as essential to the proper discharge of public worship, I deem every needless interruption of it, to be forbidden by Christian duty, as distinctly as if a direct precept had forbidden it.

And I am equally satisfied that the principles of Christian duty require, that even if we do not ourselves find that suspension of innocent amusements and social intercourses, which others do, necessary for religious improvement, yet that we should be careful, lest in the use of what we deem lawful and harmless, others should be interrupted in their more strict (yet alike conscientious) observances; or their feelings unnecessarily wounded; or they themselves led to liberties which their consciences would condemn. Many things which might to ourselves be lawful, may not, with a view to others, be expedient.

These principles lead me to think it required by Christian duty, that the common labours of life, (or

seeth, but looketh at the heart. They who, *whether they eat, or drink, or whatever they do, do all to the glory of God*, are undoubtedly, in such engagements, performing their duty to the Supreme Being. And I presume that this is what Mr. Belsham had in view, in what he has said in the passage above quoted.

in other words the pursuit of wordly interest,) should be suspended on the Lord's day ; that its engagements should, as much as possible, be so far accordant with the discharge of public religious duties, that they should not interfere with them, nor prevent their efficacy ; and that its relaxations should be of that sedate, though cheerful nature, that good impressions should not be effaced by them, the religion of others disturbed, their minds distressed, or a stumbling-block to their consciences thrown in their way.

If any consider the serious employment of the Lord's day an apology for the neglect of religion the rest of the week, then they are guilty of a great abuse of their spiritual advantages, and may be supposed to know little of vital godliness and practical faith. Frequently, however, the flames of devotion lighted up in the house of prayer, are found to cheer and animate and guide through the week : and, where the efficacy of those engagements is less experienced, acknowledged principles of duty are strengthened and brought to mind ; the influence of the mere worldly pursuits is lessened ; and motives are supplied for the more private exercises of religion, which, without its public services, would have been unthought of or ineffectual.

As far as Mr. Belsham's opinions are inconsistent with these, I differ from him. If he intended nothing but what may accord with them, it is to be regretted that his expressions were not more precise and cautious. His statements have, by many Unitarians, been thought objectionable, or at least very liable to misinterpretation ; but they in no way justify the

exaggerated representations and groundless insinuations of the Bishop of Raphoe. After having asserted, *most falsely* (see Sect. I), that "PRAYER forms no part of this Writer's system,"—and declared (notwithstanding the passage quoted in p. 250) that "in no one line of his work does he recognize it as a Christian duty,"—Dr. Magee goes on to say, "It is not then surprising that we should find Mr. B. ENDEAVOURING to diminish the opportunities and inducements to PRAYER by contending, that the Christian religion has not prescribed the appointment of a day, for the purposes of divine worship." The insinuation is groundless, and *such* an insinuation is equally cruel and criminal. It is not only without evidence, but it is against evidence. It is made with the passage directly before him which I have above quoted (p. 259), in which Mr. Belsham declares, "Of PUBLIC WORSHIP *I am a sincere advocate*;" and approves, for the reason he there assigns, of the first day of the week being employed for the purpose. So much for Dr. Magee's regard to truth and justice.

That the Bishop had the above passage in his sight, when he made this false and injurious charge, is clear from his immediately making a quotation from the very page in which it occurs. I will extract the continuance of his charges against the Unitarian advocate:

"But he goes farther. He affirms, that 'Christianity expressly abolishes every such distinction of days: * that, under the Christian dispensation every day is alike; no one

‘ more holy than another : that whatever employment, or
 ‘ amusement, is lawful or expedient upon any one day of the
 ‘ week, is equally lawful and expedient on any other day :’†
 that, consequently, a ‘ virtuous man is performing his duty to
 ‘ the Supreme Being, as really, and as acceptably, when he is
 ‘ pursuing the proper business of life, or even when enjoying
 ‘ its innocent and decent amusements, as when he is offering
 ‘ direct addresses to him, in the closet, or in the temple.’‡
 From these premises he peremptorily concludes, that all distinction of days should be exploded : that our business, and our amusements should be pursued on every day alike : and that the laws which enjoin the observance of the Sabbath are ‘ unreasonable and unjust.’§”—*Disc. and Diss.* vol. ii. p. 407 [361].

“ That the laws of any country,” says Mr. Belsham, “ should enjoin a sabbatism which God has
 “ not required, appears to me unreasonable and unjust.” For the last statement, therefore, in the above quotation, the Bishop has adequate reason. I think the opinion erroneous. I deprecate all interference of the Civil Magistrate in matters of religion ; and to make attendance on its public services a matter of civil duty and of constraint, is utterly inconsistent with the nature of religion. But it appears to me to be a question of *civil* policy, whether one day in seven shall be relinquished from the labours of life ; and of civil right, and whether such relinquishment should be enforced by law.—The labourer has a right to his day of rest ;* the religious man has a

“ † *Review*, pp. 20, 139.” “ ‡ P. 133.” “ § Pp. 140, 141.”

* “ In the first of the following Poems, I have endeavoured to describe some of the pleasures and duties peculiar to the seventh day. The appropriation of so considerable a portion of human life

right to freedom from interruption in what he deems essential duties ; and religion requires that to all the opportunity should be afforded, for obtaining that knowledge which will make them wise unto salvation. This never could be the case, if labour were not suspended at stated times, and if that suspension were not enforced by the laws of society. The religious use of this rest cannot be enforced, and ought not. But if the suspension itself were not, multitudes would be absolutely prevented from worshipping God according to the dictates of their consciences. Laws

to religious services, to domestic enjoyment, and to meditative leisure, is a most important branch of the divine dispensation. The extent of the boon appears in its most striking light, when we consider the days of rest in any given period as accumulated into one sum.—He who has seen threescore and ten years, has lived *ten years of Sabbaths*.

“ It is this beneficent institution that forms the grand bulwark of *poverty* against the encroachments of *capital*. The labouring classes *sell* their time. The rich are the buyers, at least they are the *chief* buyers ; for it is obvious, that more than the half of the waking hours of those who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow, is consumed in the manufacture of articles, that cannot be deemed either necessities or comforts. Six days of the week are thus *disposed of* already : if the seventh were in the market, it would find purchasers too. The abolition of the Sabbath would, in truth, be equivalent to a sentence, adjudging to the rich the services of the poor *for life*.”

The above passage begins the Preface of that delightful Poem, the Sabbath, written by a Clergyman who consecrated his talents and genius to religion,—the Rev. James Grahame. This Poem, with its Notes, should be published alone, as it originally was. It has been serviceable to the cause of piety and religious liberty, and will hereafter be more valued than at present.

enforcing this suspension of labour interfere with no principle of *religious* liberty, and even appear to be required by it.

So far I accord with Bishop Magee in objecting to Mr. Belsham's views : but not so in *his blending together two passages, and making ONE quotation from them ;* nor in his leaving out the first part of a paragraph and even of a sentence, which would have altered the complexion of what he has detached ; nor in his representing Mr. Belsham as making that a matter of duty, which Mr. Belsham himself only represents as not forbidden by the divine law. The intelligent discriminating Reader will not find it necessary for me to display the correctness of the charges I here make against the Bishop. I have furnished him with the three passages from Mr. Belsham's Review to which his accuser refers ; and if he will examine my evidence, he can scarcely fail to come to my conclusion, that he who desires to do *justice* to the Unitarians, (and we ask for nothing more,) will not rely upon Dr. Magee's *quotations* and *assertions* respecting those who have publicly advocated their principles.

Instead of assigning unworthy motives to Mr. Belsham in the opinions which he advances respecting the sabbatical observance of the Lordsday, Dr. Magee should have confuted them. He should have given his proof, that the Jewish law of the sabbath (which I presume he never himself observes*)

* I do not refer merely to the difference in the *day*, but to the manner of observing it.

is obligatory upon the Christian ; or that Christ or his Apostles substituted some other corresponding law in its stead. While Mr. Belsham, in reply to the tests of religion, in connection with sabbatical observances, which Mr. Wilberforce laid down,*

* I cannot close this Section, without expressing the cordial respect with which I contemplate the character of this eminent senator,—the earnest, persevering, and able exertions which, for so long a period, he made for the abolition of the slave-trade,—and the readiness and ardour with which he has, in most cases, come forward to support the various claims of religious and political benevolence.

If these pages should fall under his notice, I would respectfully urge him, as a Christian politician, to devote his abilities and his influence, in aid of an object of vast moment to the moral welfare of our country. I refer to the reformation of our revenue-laws, as it respects the sanctions by which they are supported. May I hope for the Reader's indulgence in subjoining some thoughts on this subject, which I inserted, some years ago, in the article in Dr. Rees's Cyclopaedia already referred to.

After briefly pointing out the evils of smuggling, and the immorality of encouraging it, the Author thus proceeds : “ The direct tendency of some of our revenue laws is, in various ways, to weaken the restraints of duty ; and the evil, for which individuals cannot be altogether answerable, should not be increased by their own violations. If these remarks should meet the eye of any one of those respectable senators who are concerned for the morality as well as present interests of the people, we earnestly solicit him to take into consideration the state of those laws in this particular point of view. We doubt not he will find that, in some cases, even the truly upright man, who is anxious to make no declaration but what is strictly true, can scarcely avoid departures from the exact truth, which are extremely painful to his own mind ; and that those who are but little under such restraint, are continually led, by the forms and oaths of the custom-house, to breaches of truth, sanctioned by an appeal to God, which cannot fail to loosen

maintains that these are not scriptural,—that where the written law of God is silent, with respect to positive observances, no one has a right to prescribe to another,—and that in this case every Christian is at liberty to pursue that course which the Christian spirit appears to him to direct,—I am satisfied that he has the New Testament on his side. Farther than this, if he really go farther, I do not go with him.*

the influence of an oath in all cases, and prepare the way for perjury in its worst forms. The effect of the whole, in its various ramifications, is a degree of moral injury which can scarcely be calculated: and while we experience heart-felt delight (not, however, unmixed with pain from present disappointment) at contemplating those exertions, which are designed to bring our penal law to a correspondence with the only justifiable ends of punishment, we should be disposed to place upon a level with them, efforts of the same enlightened, comprehensive, dignified, persevering nature, directed to the reformation of our revenue laws, where they unnecessarily affect the morals of the people."

* Since I sent the foregoing Section to the press, I have perused the late Rev. John Simpson's sentiments on the subject, contained in his very valuable posthumous *Essays on the Effects of Christianity, and on the Sabbath*. Without being able, in every instance, to adopt his reasonings, I join most cordially in his concluding remarks, which I earnestly urge on the attention of all who differ from the sentiments which I have here expressed. He has, in my judgment, most completely proved in them the following important position: "*The abolition of a weekly sabbath, for rest and religious worship, would be an incalculable injury to ALL ranks and conditions of men; and the regular observance of it contributes largely to the promotion of good order, virtue, and piety, and of the present and future happiness of mankind.*"—P. 124.

Of this eminent Critic and true Christian, I shall have to say a few words, hereafter, in reply to a contemptuous sneer of Dr. Magee, in his Postscript.

SECTION III.

On the Inspiration and Character of our Lord.

There are other points on which I have to express my partial disagreement with Mr. Belsham, while at the same time I cannot but severely censure the illiberal use which Dr. Magee has made of his statements. One of these respects the Inspiration and Character of our Lord.

I object to Mr. Belsham's declaring, in so general and unqualified a manner (*Calm Inq.* Part ii. §. 1, p. 451), that the inspiration of Christ, as well as that of the Apostles, was limited to "the revelation and" "proof of the doctrine of eternal life, and that the" "favour of God extended to the Gentiles equally" "with the Jews," and to the prediction of future events. It is, I am persuaded, the more general, if not the universal opinion of Unitarians, that the Gospel dispensation has also among its leading objects, the assurance of divine mercy on repentance, and, generally, the terms of acceptance with God; and that in every thing which respects the duty of man, and the divine dealings towards him, the words of Christ are to be regarded as the words of the Father who sent him. See p. 68.

I have no desire to strain this fundamental principle beyond its just application. It does not appear

to me that the notion of demoniacal possessions, any more than the universal opinion of the revolution of the sun round the earth, formed a part of the Christian revelation ; and there may be other cases in which we are to consider the expressions of our Lord as merely *founded on* prevalent opinions, and not as designed to *reveal* or *sanction* them. But the principle itself is of the utmost importance : it is what to my mind gives their authoritative value to the instructions and declarations of our Lord, and makes them weigh more with me than the best reasonings of the soundest philosopher. It is a principle which he himself expressly lays down ; and it is continually recognized in the narratives of his ministry.

Having said this, it will readily be supposed that I do not accord with my Friend in the sentiment which the following statement in his *Calm Inquiry* (p. 451) appears at least to convey,—“ that when Jesus or “ his Apostles deliver opinions upon subjects uncon- “ nected with the objects of their mission,* such

* That is, the revelation, to all mankind without distinction, of the great doctrine of a future life, a state of righteous retribution. If Mr. Belsham intended to include in this, *the assurance of divine forgiveness upon sincere repentance*, he would have prevented numbers, on both sides, from making false inferences of no small importance, if he had expressly stated this, as Dr. Priestley has done in the passages which I have already quoted, pp. 148, 145. To me it appears, that the declaration of divine mercy and of the terms of acceptance, formed an express object of the work and death of Christ, and, if an object at all, one of infinite moment.

That the authoritative assurance of divine forgiveness on repentance, is of vast moment, Mr. Belsham would undoubtedly admit ; and he virtually includes it in the expressions quoted above :

“ opinions, and their reasonings upon them, are to be
“ received with the same attention and caution with
“ those of other persons, in similar circumstances,
“ of similar education, and with similar habits of
“ thinking.”

As far as respects our Lord himself, no other person ever was in precisely similar circumstances. Believing in the genuineness of the Introduction of St. Luke's Gospel, I have myself no doubt, that, from his earliest childhood, he was impressed with the expectation of being one day called, by the direct appointment of God, to a service of the most extensive and honourable importance; and that the natural influence of this impression was aided by the constant pious cares of his Mother: so that, from the first, his views were so guided, and his affections and principles so enlarged and refined, that, even without reference to subsequent divine communications, he was eminently qualified to see clearly the way of

(p. 271), “ That the favour of God extended it to the Gentiles equally with the Jews.” As soon as this principle is declared by inspiration, the promises of God to the repentant sinner, so distinctly and authoritatively made to the Jews by his Prophets, (see, especially, Is. lv. 7,) become the privilege of the believing Gentiles. But, in my apprehension, this authoritative assurance formed, not an inferential, but an express and essential part of the grace by Christ Jesus.

For the sake of our common Unitarianism, I do certainly wish that Mr. Belsham, in condescension to the weakness of less enlarged minds among its friends, and to the prejudices of its enemies, had been more explicit on this very important point. On Unitarian principles, the sinner's hope stands on a basis as immovable as the throne of God.

duty, and to trace the dealings of his Heavenly Father. But I must, for obvious reasons, waive this consideration ; and I merely say, that he who, in addition to the expanding and animating influence of religious principle, had been favoured with the express manifestations of divine approbation, with peculiar intercourse with the Father of spirits, and with direct communications of His will, could in no respect stand on the same intellectual footing with those who, in *other* respects, were in “ similar circumstances and of similar education.”

But when, on the above too unqualified statements of Mr. Belsham, the Bishop of Raphoe represents him as maintaining, that in all matters not connected with the foregoing object, “ the opinions and reasonings “ of our Lord are to be *esteemed of no greater value* “ than those of any person of similar circumstances “ and education,” and that they are “ to be *treated* “ *with as little respect,*” he shows that he well understands the magic of words, and the dexterity with which a bold statement may be made absurd, and the feelings roused to prevent the trick from being discovered. If Dr. Magee believed that Mr. Belsham declared any such thing, it shows that whatever discrimination he possesses, was destroyed by the mists in which his system of polemical attack involves him.

The note in which these statements are made, beginning vol. ii. p. 488 [408], contains one of the few instances in which he has correctly stated the *words* of an Author whom he designs to trample in the dust ; and he appears to have felt, that here he had nothing to do but to *interpret*. But he certainly

does not do this as Mr. Belsham would have done for himself.

Mr. Belsham begins the Second Part of his *Calm Inquiry* with an account of what he terms “The Proper Unitarian Scheme, or the Doctrine of the Simple Humanity of Christ;” and he thus expresses himself at the commencement of the Section :

“The Unitarian Doctrine is, that Jesus of Nazareth was a man constituted in all respects like other men, subject to the same infirmities, the same ignorance, prejudices, and frailties—descended from the family of David, the son of Joseph and Mary, *though some indeed still adhere to the popular opinion of his miraculous conception*—that he was born in low circumstances, having no peculiar advantages of education or learning, (a) but that he was a man of exemplary character,—and that in conformity to ancient prophecy, he was chosen and appointed by God to introduce a new moral dispensation into the world, the design of which was to abolish the Jewish economy, and to place believing Gentiles upon an equal ground of privilege and favour with the posterity of Abraham : in other words, he was authorized to reveal to all mankind, without distinction, the great doctrine of a future life, in which men shall be rewarded according to their works.”—*Calm Inquiry*, p. 448.

Why Dr. Magee, in extracting the commencement of the foregoing paragraph as far as (a), omitted the clause containing the words in Italics, and why he ended his extract precisely at that point,—may be easily guessed : he has, however, *here* distinctly noticed that he has omitted something ; and I therefore pass by the impropriety of the omission. But when on this passage he founds the following statement, I know no severity of censure which would be undeserved.

“ Thus, according to Mr. Belsham, the moral as well as the intellectual imperfections, which render the opinions and reasonings of men, and more particularly of men who have had no peculiar advantages of education or learning, liable to error and exception, alike affect the opinions and reasonings of our blessed Lord ; save only on that one subject, to which, Mr. Belsham informs us, his commission was rigidly restricted.”—*Disc. and Diss.* vol. ii. p. 490 [410].

“ Mr. Belsham's language,” he says, “ seems here to cast a reflection on the moral character of our Lord.” Dr. Magee's interpretation does ; but not Mr. Belsham's language, fairly taken. If, instead of “ SUBJECT to,” Mr. Belsham had said *by nature LIABLE to*, which is what he obviously meant, I will not say that the Dissertator's system would not still have led him to say what he has said, but it would have left him without even a shadow of reason, except to the most unthinking, or to the most prejudiced.

That by natural constitution our Lord was *liable* to suffering and mortality and to sin, can be denied by no one who understands the Gospel-history. That he actually suffered and died, all must admit : that he was, by nature, liable to sin, is proved by his having been tempted ; and the Writer to the Hebrews not only maintains that he was ‘ in all things ’ ‘ like unto his brethren,’ but, that he ‘ was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin ;’ he goes farther, and declares, that ‘ he learned obedience by the things which he suffered,’ and that he was made ‘ perfect through sufferings.’ Though always excellent, always pious, humble, benevolent, pure, and holy, yet his character reached its highest perfection of stability and refinement, by those sufferings, through

which the great scheme of Gospel Redemption was alone to be accomplished, and by passing through which, with holy obedience and benevolent fortitude, he became, under the appointment of Him ‘for whom are all things and by whom are all things,’ ‘the author of eternal salvation to all who obey him.’—See Hebr. ii. 10, 17; iv. 15; v. 7—9.

Dr. Magee pays no attention to the *essential* distinction between **LIABILITY** *by nature*, and the **ACTUAL SUBMISSION**, to moral imperfections and sin; and he wishes his Readers to leave it out of sight also.

But, says this skilful Polemic, “As Mr. Belsham’s “language seems here to cast a reflection on the “moral character of our Lord, it is but justice to Mr. “Belsham to state what he has expressly said upon “this point.” I have repeatedly, I think I may say uniformly observed, that when Dr. Magee speaks of *doing justice* to his opponent, he purposes to aim at him one of his severest strokes. Of this we have immediately a specimen. He first quotes, and accurately, the following passage from Mr. Belsham, in copying which, I must employ the *Bishop’s Italics*.

“The moral character of Christ, through the whole course of his *public ministry*, as recorded by the Evangelists, is pure and unimpeachable in every particular. Whether this perfection of character in *public* life, combined with the general declarations of his freedom from sin, establish, or were intended to establish, the fact, that Jesus through the whole course of his *private* life was completely exempt from all the errors and frailties of human nature, is a question of no great intrinsic moment, and concerning which we have no sufficient data to lead to a satisfactory conclusion.”—*Calm Inquiry*, Part i. §. 5,

As Mr. Belsham thinks it is a question of no great intrinsic moment, and not to be decided, I think it might, for the sake of others, have been left unmoved. But I am sure that the discriminating equitable Reader cannot but perceive, (1) That, by *private life*, Mr. Belsham does not mean what passed in private, during our Lord's public ministry; but in the period before his baptism: (2) That the expression *the errors and failings of human nature* is clearly put in contradistinction to *sin*: (3) That, therefore, Mr. Belsham's statement has no reference whatever to "*sinful acts*," but merely to such errors and failings as cannot be considered as sin. Upon this passage, however, the Bishop says, "Here Mr. Belsham admits that we
 " have no actual proof of any sinful acts committed
 " by our Lord in his private life, so that we cannot
 " positively and satisfactorily pronounce any thing
 " upon that head." And after some sarcastic and ill-applied animadversions, he tells his Readers that Mr. Belsham afterwards " rises above the weakness
 " into which he had here allowed himself to fall;
 " and " (referring to what has been quoted in p. 275)
 " affirms of that great Being who came to redeem
 " the world from sin, that he was subject to the com-
 " mon infirmities and frailties of human nature."*

* If Dr. Magee here mean by *subject, naturally liable*, every consistent Trinitarian, who believes in the human nature of Christ, holds the same opinion. If he meant to insinuate, of which I fear there is no room to doubt, that Mr. Belsham considers our Lord as having actually fallen under moral infirmities and frailties common to human nature, he insinuates what he must know is utterly groundless.

If any one should rely on the Bishop's logic and good faith united, without considering the data on which these most injurious insinuations are founded, he will do the greatest injustice to Mr. Belsham.* And still more so, if he is influenced by the insinuation at the close of his note, that the extreme anxiety of Mr. Belsham and his Unitarian associates "to establish the apocryphal Gospel of the Nazarenes to be the true original Gospel of Matthew," (of the existence of which anxiety I know nothing,) arises from the circumstance, that that Gospel "has left us reason to believe, that '*Christ was a sinner, or at least that it is doubtful whether he was so or not.*' !!!"†

With a Writer who will descend to insinuations as calumnious as they are artful, truth stands no chance among those who will not judge for themselves.

* The words *insinuate* and *insinuation* often occur in this Part of my work, but I cannot find any others which convey my meaning.

† On the great advantage of simple Unitarianism over all other doctrines concerning the Person of our Lord, in connection with his Example and Character, I have briefly stated my views in *Unitarianism, &c.*, p. 118—122.

SECTION IV.

On the Doctrine of the FINAL RESTORATION of the Wicked to Purity, and consequently to Happiness.

As I have proceeded through this chapter, I have noticed some things, and in the course of my work I shall have to notice others, in which I differ from my respected Friend. I shall conclude it as I began, with a subject on which his sentiments are totally and inexcusably misrepresented, by a Controversialist who seems to consider it perfectly right, in order to oppose what he deems obnoxious opinions, to hold up the advocates of them, by every possible means of exaggeration, misquotation, misrepresentation, and injurious insinuation, to obloquy and contempt, and even to something closely allied to hatred.

In several parts of Dr. Magee's Appendix and in his Postscript, he chooses to represent Mr. Belsham as holding the doctrine of *Purgatory*. The Bishop, as I have before had repeated occasion to remark, knows the magic of words ; and he could not but know also, that Mr. Belsham no more believes in the doctrine of Purgatory than he himself does.

Guided by those exalted and comprehensive views of God and his dispensations which we possess through the light of Revelation, and by the indications afforded in the ordinary course of his providence, as well as in his works, that evil tends to its own

extermination, and that, under the government of Him ‘ of whom and through whom and to whom are all things,’ even evil is accomplishing His great and glorious purposes,—perceiving that moral evil is in this life often cured by suffering, and believing that a Father can punish only to restore,—discovering in some of the grand declarations of the Gospel, respecting the final consummation of all things, strong prophetic intimations, if not direct assurances, that every thing will be subdued in the rational creation of God, which is inconsistent with holiness and happiness,—and seeing nothing in the Scriptures, fairly interpreted, which opposes the delightful inferences and hopes arising from these considerations,—with the great bulk of the Unitarians, (and I trust multitudes who as yet are not Unitarians, but regard the ‘ Judge of the whole earth ’ as ‘ our Father in heaven, ’) Mr. Belsham believes, that a period will come, when the sinner, purified by suffering, will be fitted for a state of holiness and bliss. Awful, undoubtedly, and (in proportion to the degree of guilt) intense and lasting, will be those sufferings by which this blessed result will be accomplished : but CHRIST MUST REIGN TILL HE HATH PUT *ALL* ENEMIES UNDER HIS FEET.

As respects the wicked, the Christian *Revelation* appears to have principally, if not solely, in view, the period of existence (*αιων*) immediately succeeding the final account. That period is denoted by terms which are fitted, (and undoubtedly were designed by Him by whose spirit they were given,) to arouse our fears, and urge us to fly from the wrath to come. ‘ Indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish,

will be on every one who doeth evil.' But to all shall be rendered 'according to their works;' and therefore there must be *gradations* of punishment.

This consideration points to a termination of suffering. And as nothing approaching to the feelings of vindictive vengeance can have place in the Divine Mind,—and as the best notions of punishment we are able to form, require us to keep in view the reformation of the offender,—to me it appears necessarily to follow, not only from the paternal, but even from the judicial and rectorial character of God, that when suffering has done its work, and the deep stains of guilt have been removed as by fire, suffering will be no longer continued.

When unholy desires, malignant dispositions, sordid selfishness, careless impiety, and neglect of religion, have been eradicated, and the once wicked being looks up, with humble submission, to Him whose wisdom and goodness have appointed his unmingled unalleviated anguish, with humble acknowledgment that His ways are good as well as righteous, and with freedom from those bonds which made misery his home,—what *scriptural* representation of God forbids the belief, that the Father of spirits will thenceforwards commence that progress in holiness and consequent happiness, to which, through his infinite mercy, he had before raised myriads of his frail children of mortality. That, by his almighty power and infinite wisdom, He *can* thus eradicate guilt and misery, who can doubt? and that He *will* do it, who can doubt, unless He have himself told us that He will not?

Still He hath told us, by express revelation, that sin and misery are inseparably connected ; that the retribution here only in part, will be completed hereafter ; and that to those who have not accepted the gracious offers of the Gospel, or been led by present sufferings to lay hold of the hope set before them, anguish, awful in degree and duration, will be their portion ; and if not without end, ending only with the guilt which causes it.

Before a Christian Minister makes such a doctrine the object of ridicule, or presumes to trifle with views derived from the solicitous serious study of the works and ways of God, he should at least be well convinced, by alike solicitous serious study, that they are wrong. It is not the only topic on which Dr. Magee indulges in ill-timed levity and witty sarcasm ; but it is the most important one. Is he really prepared to adopt those tremendous notions of the moral government of God, which surround His throne with an awful gloom, and oblige us (which His *works* and *providence* do not,) to view Him as a Being who would have been most benevolent if He had never called the race of man at all into existence ; and as infinitely more benevolent than the popular doctrine represents Him, if, when millions of ages of misery have elapsed, He would blot out of existence those millions and millions of millions of the objects of His indignation, who for the sins of a short life have continued, through those millions of ages, in the midst of sufferings intense and unalleviated ?

This dreadful doctrine is the grand support of all the corruptions of Christianity ; and where the

inquiring mind is allowed to *dwell* upon it, it must either be rejected as a part of Christianity, or that Christianity will most commonly be openly or in effect renounced which is supposed to teach it.

Is the Bishop prepared to maintain it in all its horrors, in all its inconsistencies with the best notions we can form of the wisdom, justice, and benevolence of Him who is kind to the unthankful and to the evil, whose tender mercies are over all His works, and who is the FATHER as well as the MAKER of his creatures? If not, how could he venture upon the thoughtless profaneness of holding up to *ridicule* what is at least honourable to God, and accordant with the noblest ideas of His attributes and dispensations, solely to crush an opponent?

* It was my intention to give, in defence of these charges, some extracts from Bishop Magee's work. I shall satisfy myself with referring to the places where he represents this doctrine as the doctrine of Purgatory, and as giving a "hardened and fearless security to the impenitent offender," and makes it the object of sarcastic ridicule.—*Disc. and Diss.* vol. ii. p. 389 [343], 398 [352], and *Postscript*, p. 25 [489].

In the Bishop's zeal to associate the doctrine of Final Restoration with the absurdities of opinions which have no relation to it, he not only refers his Readers to the worst forms of Popery, and the fictions of Pagan poetry, but even to the religion of Mahomet. Now those who are acquainted with the subject could have told him, that the doctrine of Eternal Misery is a doctrine of the KORAN, though, I rejoice in the firm conviction, it is *not* the doctrine of the BIBLE. I will not transcribe some of Mahomet's expressions, in which he appears to dwell, with vindictive ferocity, on the sufferings of his enemies; but the following (among the many) which respect the duration of their sufferings, may convince the Reader that Mahometans do not hold the doctrine which Bishop Magee

That opponent, however, he has not crushed. The time will come, when the writings of **MAGEE** will only

ascribes to them. *They shall in vain implore succour of God; they shall demand of the Keeper of the fire, Will thy Lord never deliver us from these pains? He shall answer them, Ye shall abide there eternally. They shall never get out of this fire, NEITHER BE ABLE TO REPENT. THEIR PAINS SHALL BE AUGMENTED, AND PAINS UPON PAINS.*

The early Christian Fathers do not appear to have held the doctrine of Eternal Misery; and one of the ablest and best among them, Origen, maintained and publicly taught the opinion, that the sufferings of the wicked will be remedial. But, in more modern times, Christian Ministers have dwelt upon it as a fundamental doctrine of the Gospel; and there have been instances in which they have brought themselves to view the dreadful subject with complacency, and even to represent the righteous as rejoicing (Ps. lviii. 10) in the irremediable misery of those most closely connected with them. “No pity” says Boston “shall be shown them from their nearest relations. The godly wife shall applaud the justice of the Judge, in the condemnation of her ungodly husband. The godly husband shall say *Amen* to the condemnation of her who lay in his bosom. The godly parent shall say *Hallelujah* at the passing of the sentence against their ungodly child. And the ungodly child shall from his heart approve the damnation of his wicked parents, the father who begat him, and the mother who bore him.” See the whole passage in Dr. T. S. Smith’s *Illustrations*, p. 237. I have already (p. 44) referred to this very able work, and my only regret respecting it is, that the Author has connected the main argument, more than it required, and in the minds of many unfavourable to the argument, with unqualified statements founded on the doctrine of Necessity.

Various works are enumerated in the Appendix to the *Illustrations*, (and among them the Dissertations of Dr. Newton, Bishop of Bristol, who was “an able and ardent advocate of this opinion,”) which will furnish the inquirer with an ample field for research. It was to the arguments of the great Hartley, that the

be quoted as affording numerous and disgusting specimens of what controversy ought not to be. The name of BELSHAM will go down to posterity in connection with the honoured names of PRIESTLEY and LINDSEY; and those who may think that on some points his opinions are not sound, and that (like Dr. Priestley) he has occasionally given to others, which yet will bear the most rigid examination, a form that unnecessarily renders them obnoxious and repulsive, will still admire the elevation and comprehensiveness of his views, the clearness and strength and eloquence of his diction, the judicious arrangement and force of his arguments, and the energy of the understanding, and Christian principle of the heart, from which they proceeded.

And as to the cause to which this distinguished advocate has contributed his important labours, we feel a cheerful conviction, that the efforts of narrow-minded bigotry, the earnestness of mistaken zeal, the misrepresentations and obloquy of intolerance, and even the mistakes of its defenders, and, what is worse than all, the inconsistent lives of its professors, can only, in any instance, impede its progress for a time. Like that Christianity with which we cannot

Author of the present work owed, in a great measure, his first convictions; and he is satisfied that the calm and judicious reasonings of that eminent philosopher must have great weight among those who have sufficient leisure and mental culture to appreciate them. No one who takes his sentiments in their just extent, especially if in connection with that inestimable portion of his *Observations*, entitled the Rule of Life, can fail to experience their highly practical tendency. Dr. Johnson never made a wiser remark, than when he placed Hartley's *Observations* as next in value to the Bible.

but identify it, it will extend, till all men possess that knowledge which is life eternal, and, in faith and conduct, know HIM who is the ONLY TRUE GOD, and Jesus Christ whom HE hath sent.

It has already done much towards obliterating some of the worst features of what has for centuries been termed orthodoxy: and where its principles are not avowed, and where (from unhappy prepossessions) the profession of them would still be conscientiously shunned, yet multitudes who continue to arrange themselves under opposing banners, do, in spirit and in practice, view the FATHER as the ONLY TRUE GOD, make HIM the sole object of their worship and of their highest affections, and trace all the blessings of the Gospel to His grace and mercy:—in other words, whatever other name they bear, they are UNITARIANS.

Were it built by the hand of man, Unitarianism might require human support. Its friends might sorrow almost without hope, as its most powerful defenders are one after another called from the scenes of time. But they have no such solitudes. Their only anxiety is, that in the great work of reformation in the doctrines of professed Christians, and, thereby, of preparation for the extension of the Gospel throughout the world, they may be found, with holy zeal and fidelity, yet at the same time with benevolent prudence, employing their respective talents: and they deem it their honour and their happiness to be engaged in the work. The temple which they are engaged in erecting to the One and Only True God, is rested on that rock which no human force, nor the

gates of death can destroy. It rests on that foundation which God himself hath laid, and the Christian's sole foundation. And they feel a confident anticipation, that within its sacred precincts shall one day be collected all of every kindred, tongue, and people, on whom the sun of righteousness shall arise,—all whom God hath endued with an understanding to rise to him as their Creator and Preserver, their God and their Father; and all shall unite in worshipping Him, as the disciples of that Master who said, 'The true worshipper shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth.' Then will Jehovah be King over the whole earth: then shall JEHOVAH be ONE; and His NAME ONE. Then will the Christian's daily prayer be answered; even if it be not precisely according to his expectations: the kingdom of God will be come; His name will be hallowed; and His will will be done on earth as it is done in heaven.

CHAPTER VIII.

ON BISHOP MAGEE'S STATEMENTS RESPECTING THE
IMPROVED VERSION.

DISHONOURABLE as Dr. Magee's attacks are upon Mr. Asham directly and personally, it is through the Improved Version that he aims at him, and the cause which he maintains, his severest and bitterest assaults. If only a small part of them were well-founded, I do not say that cause must sink into oblivion, because its evidence does not depend upon the arguments of its advocates,—but those whom the Bishop styles the Editors of the Improved Version must have a terrible load of responsibility upon them for the injury which they have done it.

When it is considered, however, that of the different editions of the Improved Version many thousands have been sold, and that since the publication of the Bishop's *Postscript*, the London Unitarian Society have sent forth two other large impressions, it may reasonably be inferred that it has been found of essential use in ascertaining the real import of Divine Scripture, and that it has contributed to lead many to adopt that faith which was once delivered to the saints.

In the following Sections I shall offer the Reader my own views respecting it; with some strictures on Bishop Magee's.

SECTION I.

General Statements respecting the TEXT and the BASIS of the IMPROVED VERSION, and the Responsibility of the Principal Editor.

The Improved Version closely follows the text of Griesbach; in the three contemporary impressions, principally that of Griesbach's first edition, which was employed by Archbishop Newcome; and in those recently published, the text of Griesbach's second edition. And in so far as it does this, (notwithstanding all the statements which have *of late* been urged against this text, by those who have been led, through theological prepossessions, to dispute what most unbiassed Critics regard as sound principles and canons,*) it

* I shall here present the Reader with some extracts concerning the value of Griesbach's Text. The first series is from a very able and in some important respects impartial critique on the Improved Version, which appeared in the *Eclectic Review* for 1809. Those who have read the article in question, or are acquainted with the general character of the Review, will presume that it is not by a friend to Unitarianism; indeed common rumour has steadily referred it to the Rev. Dr. J. Pye Smith.

“ The last and most important present to sacred literature, is the edition of the Greek Testament by Dr. J. J. Griesbach, first published at Halle in Saxony, in 1775 and 1777; and, in a second and most carefully perfected edition, at Halle in 1796 and 1806, 2 vols. 8vo. The Prolegomena are a treasure of scriptural information and criticism. The text is formed by the unremitting

has the best claims for being a true representation of the original writings of the Apostles and Evangelists.

and patient labours of the excellent critic, its editor, from a scrutinizing and cautious use of all the proper means. From the constant habit of using the last edition, we confidently advance our opinion, that the constitution of the text in general proceeds upon a strictly upright and judicious application of the unimpeachable laws of fair criticism. In a word, we do not hesitate to say, that no man, in the present day, can justify himself to his conscience or to the public, as a satisfactory interpreter of the Scriptures and a competent defender of Christian Truth, who does not, if he has it in his power, regularly consult Mill, Wetstein, and Griesbach, or at any rate one of the latter two."—*Ecl. Rev.* for Jan. 1809, p. 37.

"The Greek text of Griesbach's last edition has a just title, above every other yet published, to be received as a standard text."—P. 39.

"We hazard nothing in saying, that the venerable Professor (Griesbach) has achieved that honourable and necessary work, which has been for ages wanted, of liberating the sacred text of the New Testament from unauthorized intrusions and alterations; and that he has exhibited it in a state so nearly approaching to its original and native form, as to exclude all probable expectation of any material improvement from future collations and critical labours."—P. 237.

The succeeding extracts are from a Critic whose opinion is of indefinitely more weight, than that of persons who have come to the subject, with minds previously unprepared, and full of theological prepossessions. If I am to be decided by *authority* on such a question, I will bow to that of the learned Translator of Michaelis, in preference to that of Dr. Lawrence and Mr. Nolan. As to Bishop Magee, it must be obvious to all who have studied the subject, that he has very little acquaintance with it.

"But after all the *materials* collected for the purpose of obtaining a correct edition of the Greek Testament, materials for which all the known libraries in Europe had been searched, and which it

Then again, the basis of the Improved Version,—the Translation of that venerable Primate whose Christian liberality and sound and extensive scriptural learning are an honour to the Church to which

had employed nearly three centuries to obtain, there was still wanted an *editor* of sufficient learning, acuteness, industry, and impartiality in the weighing of evidence, to apply those materials to their proper object. Dr. Griesbach, by his *first* edition of the Greek Testament, had already afforded convincing proofs of his critical ability: and hence the learned in general, especially in his *own* country, regarded him as the person who was best qualified to undertake this new revision of the Greek text."—*Bishop Marsh's Lectures*, Lect. viii. p. 34.

"Have those materials been *properly applied* to the emendation of the Greek text? That they were *conscientiously* applied, is admitted by every man, to whom Griesbach's character is known. His scrupulous integrity, as a man and as a scholar, is sufficient guarantee for the honest application of them. Nor have his contemporaries ever questioned either his learning, or his judgment, if we except Matthæi, who wrote under the influence of personal animosity."—*Ibid.* p. 38.

"That Griesbach has fulfilled the duties, which in these respects he owed to the public, that his diligence was unremitted, that his caution was extreme, that his erudition was profound, and that his judgment was directed by a sole regard to the evidence before him, will *in general* be allowed by those, who have studied his edition, and are able to appreciate its merits."—*Ibid.* p. 44.

"The edition thus minutely described is the most important, which has been hitherto published: nor is it probable, that during the lives even of the youngest of my hearers any other critical edition should supersede it. From the exertions which have been already made, it is not likely that new materials of much importance should be brought to light: and even if there should, it is still less likely, that *another* such editor should be found to arrange and digest them."—*Ibid.* p. 45.

he belonged,—is distinguished for its general fidelity and simplicity ; and though Newcome's Revision sometimes unnecessarily departs from the Public Version, (especially in two or three modes of expression of frequent occurrence,*) yet whenever the Public

* One of these, which necessarily strikes the attention, is the change of *blessed* (μακαριος) in Matt. v. and elsewhere, into *happy*. *Blessed*, when used in reference to human beings, seems always to convey the idea of happiness *as resulting from the ordination of Providence* ; and in some instances the use of *happy* appears improper, as, perhaps necessarily, implying a *present* state of mind, which *blessed* does not. A person may be *blessed* when he is in deep distress ; but he is not *happy* : and afflictions may be *blessings*, but they are not *happiness*. That *blessed*, in a different sense, is used as the translation of ευλογητος, is no sufficient reason for employing a word which does not convey the force required.

The translation of Κυριος, in the Improved Version, by *Sir* or *Master*, often offends the ear accustomed to the phraseology of the Public Version. If in some cases *Lord* convey too much, *Sir* seems in others to convey too little. The *Eclectic Reviewer*, however (p. 337), approves of the rendering of the Improved Version, wherever Κυριος is employed only as a compellation of respect ; and would confine the rendering *Lord* to those cases where there is a reference to the Deity, or where there is at least some recognition of the person and office of the Messiah. The *principle* laid down in this last exception is satisfactory. To this may be added, that at least in citations from the Old Testament, Κυριος, in reference to the Deity, should be rendered *Jehovah*.

In the alterations on the Public Version which Newcome has made in rendering Κυριος, the Improved Version follows him. The strictures made on the Editors, therefore, *primarily* refer to the *Archbishop*. Dr. Magee (*Postscr.* p. 226) talks of “ the modern and *janty* phrase ” employed for this word by “ the light and airy critics of the Improved Version : ” and what I regard more, Dr. Nares, *Remarks*, p. 35 [40], passes the following censure on the *Improved Version*, when, in reality, in the only instances he gives

Version is revised by authority, more of the characters of Newcome's Revision will undoubtedly be found in the new translation, (especially in the Epistles,) than of that at present in use.

From the excellent translation of Newcome, the which respect the *translation*, it merely follows *Newcome*. "In regard to those two great doctrines of our Saviour's pre-existence and divinity" (says Dr. Nares,) "we find nothing but evasion: evasion the most *systematic*, and a choice of terms the most invariably *technical*, as appropriate exclusively to their own system of belief. Thus it is that *Kυρις*, as addressed to our Lord, is too commonly rendered Sir, or Master, or Teacher; and the term *προσκυνηειν*, under the same circumstances, never allowed to stand for more than the mere act of obeisance."—In these cases, at least, the charge of *systematic* EVASION rests solely with NEWCOME,—a man whose love of truth, humility and candour, patient research, sound judgment, extensive scriptural knowledge, and conscientious piety, only required the finish of energetic fortitude to raise him to the first rank among our Divines.

There is one word of frequent occurrence in the Epistles, which is, I think, unhappily rendered by Newcome, whom the Improved Version in this case follows throughout. I refer to *χαρις*, *grace*, *favour*. According to Mr. Rennel (*Animadv.* p. 48), "to the word *grace*, when used in theological writing, the general consent of our nation has attached the idea of *the favourable influence of God on the human mind, or the effect of that influence*." If this had been the extent of the common theological import of the word, I suspect that Newcome would not have left the usual mode of expression. Still it does not appear that *favour* does, or ever can, express the frequent force of *χαρις*; and I decidedly prefer reverting to the word *grace*, leaving it to the theologian to ascertain its import. In the religious application of the term, I understand *χαρις* to denote *the favour and mercy offered to us in the Gospel, the gracious benignity and favour from which it proceeds, and the various blessings we derive from it*: and *grace*, in my judgment, much better expresses all this than *favour*.

Improved Version varies much less than might antecedently have been expected; and with a few (unfortunate but, I am confident, most unintentional) exceptions, it shows, in all cases, what his own rendering is. Whatever advantages, therefore, the Scripturalist can derive from the Primate's *translation*, he may derive also from the Improved Version, together with those additional ones which arise from a still more unrestrained and alike conscientious study of the New Testament by Unitarian Writers. For these variations from Newcome, in most cases of importance, the evidence is afforded; and the Reader is not bound to adopt a rendering, merely because the Improved Version has it so. It is sanctioned by no royal mandate; nor by that powerful influence which the Public Version receives from long usage, from the universal diffusion of it, from the employment of it in the worship of the Establishment and among all the Protestant Dissenters, and from the supports which it yields to popular theology,—as well as from its general value, and its engaging simplicity in some of those parts which come most home to the heart and to the understanding.

The merits of the Improved Version, (as far as they are distinct from those of the Primate's,) we all, I believe, freely refer to the judgment and the talents of Mr. Belsham; and I am not aware that he would object to be responsible for what may be deemed its defects. He has never represented the work as exempt from them.

The expense of printing the Improved Version was defrayed from the funds of the London Unitarian

Society, aided by other Societies of a similar nature and in the first instance by an extensive subscription: and it was a wise and important appropriation of those funds. But I am not aware that the Unitarian body are any farther answerable for the Improved Version; except, indeed, for valuing it, and valuing it not less for the unwarantable misrepresentations which have been made of it, and the abuse, vulgar and learned, to which it has been exposed.*

* Among the most unwarrantable of these, is the unprincipled representation in the Preface to the *Animadversions on the Unitarian Translation*, by a *Student in Divinity*, now avowed to be Mr. Rennel. The Student, in a style of unfounded sarcasm which is not exceeded by any thing in Bishop Magee's work, represents the *Editors of the Improved Version* as DENYING A FUTURE STATE OF RETRIBUTION. This is the *ne plus ultra*. I will quote the passage, and leave it to the Reader's own reflection.

“ Deism itself cannot present to our view a more dreary and cheerless waste than this IMPROVED Christianity has done, by removing every object to which our faith can be directed, or our hope aspire. All that is left for our consideration is a system of morality, which, however excellent in itself, may be either preserved or discarded as it best suits our humour or inclination. Where no future reward is proposed to animate our obedience, nor any future punishment to restrain the impulse of tumultuous passion, every system of morality must be nugatory and ineffectual. Not that I would suppose that the Improving Translators have any particular objection to future rewards, had the offer been unaccompanied with the threat of future punishments; but the terror of a just retribution is far too degrading both to the pride and to the sensuality of man, to be admitted as an article of belief. *Let us eat and drink—for if to-morrow we die, all is well: if we live, we shall enjoy a state of happiness in the life to come, as a reward for having broken those rules of Christian morality which we*

No limit, probably, can be set to the responsibility of the principal Editor. He is responsible for the

found it inconvenient to preserve, and for having successfully indulged our vicious propensities while we remained upon earth. Such liberal and enlightened doctrine cannot fail of enlisting numerous proselytes, and their conversion cannot fail of producing the happiest effects on the state of virtue and morality throughout the world."—*Animadversions*, Pref. vii.

I know nothing which the Student's *Animadversions* have to recommend them to public notice. He came to the examination with so little critical knowledge, that in his Note on Luke xxiii. 48, he actually cites *Justin* as the Author of the *Quæstiones et Responsiones ad Orthodoxos*, though the Benedictine Editors, (whose edition the Student appears to have cited,) do themselves declare that "it is needless to prove it not to be work of Justin, the thing is so evident." (*Lardner's Works*, vol. ii. p. 118.) What a triumph would the Student have had over the Editors, if they had made so palpable a blunder, in order to confute an opponent!

The Student has seldom made any distinction between the renderings of Archbishop Newcome, and the alterations of the "Improving Translators." Common equity—but, after the specimen I have already given, who can look for common equity from Mr. Rennel?—would have led him to state, when he was writing his notes on Matt. viii. 2, xxvi. 31, 56, xxviii. 17, and Luke iv. 22, for instance, that his strictures affected the Improved Version only because it followed Newcome. The first and last of these are remarkable. The Primate renders *προσεκυνει*, *did him obeisance*; (and so in various other instances, where the Public Version has *worship*, and where I should prefer *do him homage*.) This the Student objects to; and says "the same word, ii. 2, is rendered '*worshipped*.'" What he means I cannot tell; for in Newcome, and in the Improved Version, Matt. ii. 2, it is rendered, *do him obeisance*. This is a proof of singular negligence: but the next is one of a more serious cast. The Improved Version has in Luke iv. 22, 'and wondered at the graceful words which proceeded out of his mouth.' This gives the Student an opportunity of saying, that

masterly digest of the principles of textual criticism contained in the Introduction : he is responsible for the Notes, either as respects the selection from others, or the sentiments he has embodied in them : and he is responsible for the Translation itself, (so far, at least, as it differs from Newcome's,) having, it may reasonably be supposed, in no instance adopted the suggestions of others, unless he were satisfied of their correctness.

In the variations from his basis, I can generally, though by no means universally, agree with him : and my chief objections against the *Translation*, rest against Newcome's own renderings. I wish they had been left much more frequently ; and especially for the purpose of avoiding all needless (and therefore undesirable) departures from the familiar phraseology of the Public Version.

“ the Improving Translators have an *irresistible antipathy* to this
 “ word *grace* ; and almost in every instance where *χαρις* occurs,
 “ they render it *favour*.” He afterwards particularly adverts to
 Rom. i. 5, where, he says, “ they change the construction of the
 “ words, and introduce a form of expression at once INDECOROUS
 “ AND ABSURD, ‘ the favour of an Apostleship,’ FOR THE PURPOSE
 “ of invalidating the true meaning of *χαρις*.” This charge is, in
 reality, made by one who obviously was a mere “ Student in Divi-
 nity,” against the venerable Primate, whose life had been devoted
 to the study of the Scriptures, and who left the world a noble le-
 gacy, in his *Attempt towards Revising our English Translation of the*
Greek Scriptures. The Improving Translators have in this case
 no farther demerit than that of following their judicious and
 learned guide.—That I generally prefer the common rendering
 of *χαρις* does not lower my opinion of the presumption and
 injustice of the censure.

In the very small number of instances in which Mr. Belsham has intentionally left Griesbach's text, I am constrained to differ from him.

The Notes of the Improved Version, I regard as a comprehensive and luminous summary of a great mass of important criticism on the theological import of the New Testament, and occasionally on the original text. That I am not able to accord with all of them, does not prevent my expressing my sense of their general value. And this estimation is not lessened by the conviction, which has never been shaken, that the Notes which were not necessary to vindicate the translation or the changes in the text, should have been made a separate publication. I think it probable, however, that in this opinion I am in a decided minority: but the Unitarian is necessarily accustomed to think that of no great moment. In the first instance, truth most commonly is so circumstanced.

Some of those points in which the Notes in the Improved Version appear to me to be founded on wrong principles of interpretation, will appear in the course of this work. I feel myself obliged here to express my dissent from most of those on the Introduction of St. Luke's Gospel; and from some of those on the Introduction to St. Matthew's.*

* If I should be enabled to fulfil my purpose of preparing a new edition of *Unitarianism* &c., I shall be led to examine a little the statements in the Improved Version respecting the genuineness of Luke i. ii. I shall at present merely say a few words on the "*chronological difficulty*."

I quite agree with Mr. Belsham in rejecting the hypothesis, that

It is not my object to examine, at length, all the censures passed by Bishop Magee on the Improved Version : nor is it necessary. Much as it has been

St. Luke reckoned from the time when Tiberius assumed the proconsular government in conjunction with Augustus. I have repeatedly considered the arguments of Lardner, with a perfect willingness to receive his opinion ; but I can see nothing amounting to proof, that St. Luke employed a date, which, to say the least, was extremely unusual at that period, and of which no clear instance is adduced. The hypothesis is necessary to reconcile the date assigned by St. Luke to the commencement of John's Ministry, with the statements of the Introductory History prefixed to St. Matthew's Gospel ; but not with those of St. Luke's own Introduction. If this be taken independently of the former, (and to me it appears that they cannot be reconciled in some other respects,) the chronological difficulty vanishes at once. And when any one gives up the genuineness of the Introduction to St. Matthew, he has no ground to employ it to invalidate the Introduction of St. Luke.

Taking St. Luke's Gospel alone, (considering it, for instance, as the ' most excellent Theophilus ' naturally would, an independent history,) the case stands thus. The Baptist began his Ministry in the 15th year of Tiberius, which commenced Aug. 19, A. U. 781. If we place the Baptism of our Lord in the following January or February, A. U. 782, (which is the earliest date we can assume,) and suppose that he was not yet thirty-one years of age, (as St. Luke's words, ch. iii. 23, appear clearly to imply,) we must place his birth in A. U. 751.

Now there is nothing in St. Luke's Introduction inconsistent with this. All that the statement in ch. i. 5, requires us to admit, is, that the heavenly message to Zacharias occurred in Herod's reign. If Herod, as is most probable, died in March, A. U. 750, St. Luke's Introduction renders it necessary to place our Lord's birth before the middle of A. U. 751.—INDEPENDENTLY of the Introduction to St. Matthew, there is no chronological difficulty whatever in St. Luke's Introduction.

the fashion in the Orthodox world, to cry up the *Discourses and Dissertations*, the *Postscript* to the *Appendix*, must operate, among all who know what to expect from learning, talent, and polite culture, as a dead weight upon the preceding volumes. It would be difficult to produce any recent work of much extent, proceeding from a person possessed of those qualities, (as the Bishop undoubtedly is,) so destitute of all the qualities which should adorn the Scholar, the Critic, and the Divine. I know of none. It may be resorted to, as it has been, by those who presume that Dr. Magee is a good authority; and who want his aid to enable them to revile that which they have not examined for themselves: but never as a specimen of lucid arrangement, close and perspicuous reasoning, sound criticism, and controversial equity.

It would be a mere waste of time to go through all the Bishop's diffuse and discursive argumentation; but I shall make a few remarks, to convince those who might otherwise rely upon him, that they are following a guide who will lead them into error and injustice. I am the more disposed to this, because some remarks on the Improved Version which I wrote soon after its appearance, have obviously furnished the weapons on which Bishop Magee mainly relies.

SECTION II.

ARCHBISHOP NEWCOMB'S REVISION *really the Basis of the*
IMPROVED VERSION.

Two charges are continually made against the Editors of the Improved Version, which have been repeated in every possible form. One is, that they were guilty of bad faith in representing the publication as proceeding from "*A Society for promoting Christian Knowledge and the Practice of Virtue by the Distribution of Books,*"—inasmuch as there is a well-known, numerous, and long-established association, composed entirely of members of the Established Church, which is denominated "*The Society for promoting Christian Knowledge.*" The other is, that the Editors have employed the version of Archbishop Newcome merely as a blind, to enable them to palm off on the Public their own departures from the Authorized Version, and to give a kind of sanction to their opinions.

I am ready to allow that the omission of the word Unitarian, in the title-page of the three contemporary editions, first printed, was injudicious, even if perfectly accordant with the simplicity of Christian truth. It was obviously designed to prevent prejudice from instantly taking the alarm; and closing the book on the bare inspection of the title-page, with the conviction

that nothing good could come from the Unitarians.* But this was all. It was designed to keep out of

* I once saw an excellent practical Christian, a wealthy, liberal, and intelligent, though not learned, man, take up Newcome's Revision in a Bookseller's shop. His Orthodox opinions led him to examine the Proem of St. John's Gospel. Finding all right there, he turned to the passage respecting the Three Witnesses; and seeing this heretically curtailed, he closed the book without further inspection.

Bishop Magee informs his Readers (*Postscript*, p. 315), that "Unitarians, in general, read none but the writings of Unitarians;" but here, as in many other cases, he shows that he knows nothing about us. Mr. Belsham certainly has expressed the opinion (*Reply to Dr. Moysey*, p. 179), that the perusal of Dr. Magee's work is "a task—to which no human patience has yet been found adequate, or ever will." I have heard, on good authority, of a Unitarian who has read it through *twice*. Has any Trinitarian ever done so? That many Trinitarians will not read Unitarian books, is a better ascertained opinion than either Bishop Magee's or Mr. Belsham's. Many plainly tell us that they would as soon expose themselves to the plague.

The following little narrative may illustrate *my* case. The Brother of the Reverend Prebendary whom I have already mentioned (p. 70), during the Exeter Controversy, put forth a two-penny tract, entitled *The Athanasian Creed Examined*, by a *Rational Christian*: and he cited in the Title, with my name, a passage from one of my Letters, in which was quoted Archbishop Tillotson's well-known declaration respecting that Creed, viz. that he wished the Church well rid of it. Altogether, the publication seemed to come from the Socinian heretics. The Preface, however, set things to rights: since the Rev. John Dennis spoke of the excellent Tillotson as another Judas who betrayed his Master, and, subjoining his own name, gave us to understand that he thus fought under false colours, because he thought his tract would not otherwise be read by the Unitarians. If he had entitled it a *DEFENCE of the Athanasian Creed*, many more of us would have read it, if it

view an obnoxious appellation ; but not to assume one which did not belong to it. It did not say all ; but all that it said was true. As to its leading any to suppose that it had its origin in the Bartlett's Buildings' Society, that is utterly out of the question. Let it be proved that it did mislead any one, and we will then allow that it might. But even then we will not allow that it was intended to do so.

I have BISHOP MAGEE's *authority* for saying, that MR. BELSHAM is INCAPABLE of *duplicity* (see p. 213): and upon a better knowledge of Mr. Belsham than the Bishop can have, I affirm, without hesitation, that he had not the slightest intention to lead any to suppose that the publication proceeded from the Church Society for promoting Christian Knowledge. The omission of the distinguishing name, however, is not accordant with Mr. Belsham's usual system ; and I presume, therefore, that it was adopted in compliance with the timid caution of others. But, after all, if the Unitarian badge is continually to expose a man to be pelted with mud and stones, it is not surprising if he do not always think it necessary to wear it when he walks the streets. When the rights of conscience are properly respected, distinctive

had only been for the novelty of the thing. In the abundance of his zeal, Mr. Dennis sent copies to some of the neighbouring Clergymen, with *From the Author* in the Title-page. One of his friends, presuming from the Title that it was a Unitarian production, and that I had sent it, (a liberty to which I had no claim,) transmitted it immediately to me unopened, with a civil note, informing me that he did not choose to read what might unsettle his mind as to the Ritual which he was bound to observe.

appellations in religion will cease to be terms of reproach.*

The second charge is still more unfounded, and it is as unjust as it is important. The Introduction plainly states the reasons for not employing Mr. Wakefield's translation, and for fixing upon Archbishop Newcome's, as the basis of the Improved Version; and the surmises of Bishop Magee on the subject deserve only this reply—**PROVE THEM**. They present themselves without the shadow of proof; and simply assert that they are as groundless as they are absurd.—The Bishop *knows* that the responsible Editor is a man of honour and of Christian principle; but if all his assertions respecting him were true, he ought to be driven out of respectable society. What shall we say of him who makes them without any proof whatever; and, in making them, charges him with bad faith, and even with direct falsehood?*

* I have already given the Reader some specimens of Bishop Magee's opprobrious language respecting Unitarians; and before I end this portion of my work, I shall have occasion to notice some more. But as I have passed some very severe censures upon him, it is necessary, (in order to show the justice of them to those who have not perused his work with attention,) that I should adduce my evidence. The following expressions &c. selected from the *Postscript*, may be added to those cited in pp. 76, 116, 243, 244, &c., and especially respecting the Editors of the Improved Version, and aimed throughout at Mr. Belsham.

In a passage already cited (*Postscr.* p. 4), Dr. Magee attributes to the Editors "the grosest ignorance, and especially of the original language of the New Testament." In p. 10, he speaks of their insingenuousness in using Archbishop Newcome's name for the purpose of "securing a respectable name for their *Unitarian*

That the Improved Version really has Newcome's translation as its basis, is clear from the following

“blasphemies, and contriving to circulate their poisons under a false label :” and he declares that, as he deems *“the opinions held by modern Unitarians to be blasphemous and pestilential,”* he *“cannot in truth and justice denominate them by any other terms.”* In the same page he charges the Editors with *“deception and falsehood ;”* and in p. 14, with *“falsehood and fraud,”* employed to procure *“a circulation by drawing in unsuspecting purchasers.”* In p. 62, he represents it as *“lamentable that they whose time might be better employed than in combating the follies of Unitarian Expositors, should be detained by such arrant and inexplicable nonsense.”* *“Rules of grammar are of no value,”* he says, p. 151, professing to represent the critical system of the Improved Version, &c. *“One rule only is to be attended to. All tenses are to be intermixed, all times to be confounded ; provided only that that exalted Being, the Son of God, who fills all time, shall be confined to such a portion of it, as falls to the lot of mere, miserable, mortal man.”* As if the Unitarians were such *“fools,”* in the worst sense of the word, as to suppose it possible so to confine such a Being ; or so daringly impious as to attempt it ! The charge means nothing, or is utterly false. In a similar spirit we find the Bishop, in p. 154, representing the Editors as quoting a criticism of Wakefield's falsely, which, he says, *“is dealing treacherously with the WORD OF GOD ; and is but too well worthy of the cause in which they are engaged, who would blaspheme the Majesty of the SON OF GOD.”* This censure I shall have occasion to advert to hereafter ; as well as to cite one or two others ; and I will therefore only add to this selection, which might easily be made much more ample, that the Bishop says (p. 315), that the *“unlearned Unitarians”* are *“abused”* by Mr. Belsham, *“whom they refer to as their oracle ;”* and that he is able so *“to abuse them”* *“without the danger of detection ;”*—that (p. 237) he attributes *“trick”* to the Editors, where they have merely followed Newcome, to whom the TRICK (if it had been one) must have been attributed ;—and as if not satisfied with explicit declarations and

facts. Upon an average, there are not two variations from it in a page. These, in nineteen cases out of twenty, consist of alterations in single words, such as *Wealth* for *Mammon*, *propose* for *show*, *is* for *flourisheth*, *departure* for *departing*, *hardness* for *blindness*, &c. There are not twenty verses in the whole work, in which the variations from the Primate's Version have any close connection with peculiarities of theological sentiment. Many of the alterations are those proposed by Newcome himself. I go farther, and say that the general spirit and character of the translation is decidedly Newcome's. Those who have dwelt solely on the doctrinal variations from the Primate's Version, till they have magnified them tenfold to their own imaginations, will not be disposed to admit this last position: but those preceding they cannot deny; at least they cannot refute them; and upon them I found it. If the Public Version had been fixed upon as the basis, and

charges, he leaves his reader to imagine something still worse than he says, by such a wild insinuation as the following (p. 164):
"The mere circumstance of overlooking or suppressing may easily be admitted, where PRACTICES of MUCH HIGHER ORDER OF DISINGENUOUSNESS are found to be FAMILIAR."

If ever the Bishop of Raphoe should publicly retract, and apologize for, such shocking imputations as this Note and that in p. 243 present to the Reader, I shall feel respect for him. Till there is room to hope that he heartily regrets making and diffusing them, respecting one of whom he has declared, vol. ii. p. 430 [385], *and still declares, in the very edition with which the Postscript is printed, that he believes him to be "INCAPABLE OF DUPLICITY,"* I must regard him as under the infatuation of intolerant bigotry and personal hostility.

the Improved Version had left it only in the cases in which it has now left Newcome, no one who read with a 'clear' eye, could have hesitated in allowing, that the general spirit and character was decidedly that of its basis. And this is the case now.

On this point, and some others connected with the Improved Version, I claim that right to be believed, which arises from a solicitous, patient, and (I trust) unbiassed examination of it, when engaged in reviewing it for the *Monthly Repository*; the results of which still approve themselves to my mind: and those Readers of Dr. Nares's Remarks on the Improved Version, who recollect the terms in which he speaks, in various places, of the Unitarian Reviewer, may be disposed to allow my claim.*

It ought to be allowed, for I furnished to the opponents of the Improved Version some of their most powerful weapons against it. I cannot wonder that they should avail themselves of those remarks which, in opposition to personal feelings and to the natural impulse of whatever party-spirit I possess, I deemed it my duty to make, openly and unreservedly. That they should have been so employed as they have by Bishop Magee and those who rely upon him, has often given me pain; but, though it was not in my contemplation at the time, it has not changed my convictions that I did right.

Those which Dr. Magee has most employed, respect the *unacknowledged* variations from Newcome. The system of the Improved Version was, to place

* See, for instance, p. 51, 184; or 2d Ed. p. 58, 214.

the Archbishop's rendering in the margin, whenever it was altered in the text. If this had in every instance been done, some of the keenest censures would have been prevented. That in a small number of cases it was neglected, its friends regretted ; but they knew, what others have no reason whatever to doubt, that the omission must have been *utterly unintentional*.

When engaged in reviewing the Improved Version for the Monthly Repository, I wished to have before me, a synoptical statement of all the variations from the Primate's Revision, which I had been constantly in the habit of employing, from the period of its publication in 1800,* and valued most highly. At my request, a young Friend, (now filling an honourable station in the Unitarian Church,) in whose accuracy I had abundant reason to place full confidence, undertook to draw up the table I wished, This led him to collate the two versions, which he did with great patience and fidelity. He discovered some variations from the basis, which were not noticed ; and I thought it right to point them out. It is not too much to say that, but for this, neither Bishop Magee, nor any others who have censured the Improved Version, would have been aware of their existence.

Dr. Nares adverted to the Unitarian Reviewer's statements ; and it was probably through the strictures

* The Primate's Revision is dated, in the Imprint, 1796. It was not, I believe, *published* till after his death.

of that much abler Critic, that Bishop Magee discovered the fine field for opprobrious and vindictive censure which these disclosed to him, and on which he entered, with incautious eagerness, when his fourth edition was required. When the information afforded by the Reviewer was made the ground-work of a series of coarse animadversions, expanded through a volume of between three and four hundred pages, it would have been equitable for the Author to have frankly said whence he derived it; and to have added the opinion of the Writer from whom it was derived. After specifying the unnoticed variations,* the Unitarian Reviewer adds,

“ In most of these instances the variation is completely unimportant; but in some, as will be obvious to the Reader, the change should have been very carefully noticed: we particularly refer to Matt. xiii.; John iii. 18; Rom. ix. 5; 2 Cor. viii. 9, and Heb. xii. 35. *No one can suppose THAT THE OMISSION AROSE FROM ANY WANT OF FIDELITY, or of respect for Newcome's opinion, who observes the minuteness with which variations are noticed, and the numerous instances in which a preference is given to his own renderings, where yet an alteration is made in the text.*”—*Monthly Repository for 1809*, p. 218.

* In the Appendix to this volume, I will specify the instances in which the Improved Version leaves Newcome's Revision. The Reader will then have the *whole* case before him.

SECTION III.

*the Specific Cases in which the IMPROVED VERSION leaves
ARCHBISHOP NEWCOME'S REVISION without
due acknowledgment.*

Of the unnoticed variations from Newcome's revision, Bishop Magee selects six. These he introduces as a FEW of the NUMEROUS examples which might be cited: and at the close of the enumeration, he asserts that "*these specimens*" "*are but a VERY FEW out of the number that might be adduced, of IMPORTANT UNACKNOWLEDGED DEPARTURES from Newcome's Version.*" And then, of course, he *sinuates* that the Primate's rendering has, in these cases, been "*deliberately and UNACKNOWLEDGEDLY rejected and altered*" by the Editors, to promote their predominant opinions.—*Postscript*, p. 18 [482].

Either the Bishop of Raphoe knew, or he did not know, in what instances the Improved Version, as first printed, leaves the Primate's without acknowledgment. If he did not, he was guilty of extreme precipitancy and carelessness," when he made the rash and unfounded assertion I have cited. *If he did*, no censure, however severe, could be unjust; for the assertion would then be a violation of common veracity. At any rate, the Reader will perceive, by consulting the specification I shall give him, that he

312 EXAMINATION OF DR. MAGEE'S STATEMENTS.

has said what is incapable of proof, being contrary to fact.*

• “ *This AFFIRMATION is the whole of his PROOF,*” says Dr. Magee, in reference to Mr. Belsham. With vastly more correctness may the censure be continually passed upon the Bishop himself. The present is a remarkable and very material exemplification of my statement.

I think it a matter of justice to the Editors to state the evidence on this point at length; and the Reader will find it in the Appendix.

On examining it, he will perceive that there is not the *least foundation* for the Bishop's representations. He will find that it is *not true*, that those which he has selected are “ but a *very few* out of the number ” “ of IMPORTANT unacknowledged departures : ” he will find that besides those which he has adduced, (more than one of which, as will shortly appear, are wholly unimportant,) there are ONLY TWO which are important,—the alteration of *age* for *world*, in Matt. xiii. 39, 40, 49; and that in chap. xix. 17, which arises from following Griesbach's second edition : and he will also find that, in the former, the Improved Version has adopted Newcome's *marginal* rendering; and that, in the latter, *the alteration materially affects one of the strong holds of Unitarianism*. Where was the Bishop's honour, when he made so random an assertion? The worst of it is, that he either depended upon the report of others respecting the information furnished by the Unitarian Reviewer, or, having the Reviewer's statements before his eyes, he was prevented from seeing the truth by those dispositions which so often manifest themselves in his work, but especially in his Postscript.

Of the other unacknowledged departures from Newcome, the Reader will find, from the specification in my Appendix, that several are in cases where the Improved Version follows Newcome's marginal rendering; and others are where similar alterations had been noticed in the context.

Altogether I do not hesitate to say that, of all the rash and unfounded charges made by Bishop Magee against Unitarian Writers, the one I refer to is among the most injurious and groundless.

Though Mr. Belsham, whose pen is still as full of vigour and energy as ever, has subjoined to his Bampton Lecturer Reproved, a regular consideration of the charges thus made against him, vitally affecting, if they were not altogether groundless, even his moral character, yet as I have, in some sense, drawn them upon him, I shall make a few strictures upon them: and for this purpose I shall quote the singular passage which the Bishop makes the text of his ill-digested rambling Postscript. It is printed exactly as follows:

I. Luke i. 35.—*Newcome*—"therefore that holy child also who shall be born of thee, shall be called **THE** Son of God."—*Imp. Vers.*—"therefore that holy child also who shall be born of thee shall be called **A** Son of God."

II. John i. 12.—*N.*—"But as many as received him, to them he gave **POWER TO BECOME** children of God."—*I. V.*—"But as many as received him, to them he gave **AUTHORITY TO BE THE** children of God."

III. John iii. 13.—*N.*—"Now no man **GOETH** up to heaven, but he who came down from heaven, *even* the Son of man, who **WAS** in heaven."—*I. V.*—"Now no man **HATH ASCENDED** up to heaven, but he who came down from heaven, *even* the Son of man, [who **IS** in heaven.]"

IV. Rom. ix. 5.—*N.*—"Whose are the fathers, and of whom, **AS CONCERNING THE FLESH**, Christ *came*, who **IS OVER ALL**, **GOD BLESSED** for ever, **AMEN.**"—*I. V.*—"Whose are the fathers, and of whom, **BY NATURAL DESCENT**, Christ *came*. **GOD, WHO IS OVER ALL, BE BLESSED** for ever."

V. 2 Cor. viii. 9.—*N.*—"For ye know the gracious goodness of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, **THOUGH** he was rich, yet for your sakes he **BECAME POOR**, that through his poverty ye might be rich."—*I. V.*—"For ye know the gracious goodness of our Lord Jesus Christ, that **WHILE** he was rich, yet for your

sakes he LIVED IN POVERTY, that through his poverty ye might be rich."

VI. Hebr. xii. 25, 26.—*N.*—"See that ye refuse not HIM who speaketh. For if those escaped not who refused him THAT uttered THE ORACLES OF GOD on earth, much MORE we *shall* NOT *escape*, if we reject him WHO WAS from heaven : whose voice then shook the earth : but now he hath promised," &c. —*I. V.*—"See that ye refuse not GOD who speaketh. For if those escaped not who refused him WHEN HE uttered ORACLES ON earth, much LESS *shall* we *escape*, if we reject him SPEAKING from heaven : whose voice then shook the earth : but now he hath promised," &c.—*Postscript*, p. 16 [480].*

These cases I must consider separately ; and, in so doing, I will afford the Reader all the accommodation in my power. The Bishop gives him none. From the beginning of this new volume of 367 pages, to the end, there is no resting-place either for the eye or for the mind, no means of reference from the place where the charges are made, to those where they are considered in detail.

I. LUKE i. 35.—*Postscript*, p. 18 [482].

On this passage I need not say much. The Bishop represents it (p. 50) as reaching "to the very vitals of Unitarianism ;" and he is not contented with asserting that "it does," but that it "is confessed to do" so. If he mean that it is by Unitarians, he labours under great error ; for I do not believe that

* I shall presume upon the Reader's turning back to the corresponding number of this extract from Dr. Magee. I hope I shall be excused if, in what follows, I do not always subjoin the page of the 4th edition. It may be always found by adding 464 to the reference here given.

any one among us would think his Unitarianism at all affected, in whatever way it is rendered. Many Unitarians, as Dr. Magee knows, still maintain the miraculous conception of our Lord ; and as to the principal Editor of the Improved Version, as he believes that the first two chapters of St. Luke do not form a part of genuine Scripture, it is perfectly frivolous to suppose that *he* thought the alteration of any weight in the argument.

That the alteration should have been noticed, is admitted ; but that the acknowledgment was *intentionally* suppressed, there is not even a plausible pretence to say.

That it is *possible* to make errors in such minutiae, without dishonest intention, I presume the Bishop himself will admit, when I inform him, that in his zeal to detect in the Improved Version departures from its general system of acknowledgment, (or rather to *expose* them, for I see no room to believe that he *detected* them himself,) he has committed an error just as bad as the Editors', and with much less excuse, because he had nothing to do but to quote accurately, which, however, he seldom does. In p. 31 he says, " In verse 32 also, just preceding, we find " *Newcome* use the definite article, ' He shall be great, " ' and shall be called THE Son of the most High.' " And in this likewise the *followers* of Newcome " *desert* him, rendering ' A Son of the most High,' " and giving no notice whatever of the departure." Is it not singular that, while holding up to public view the errors of others, and attributing to them an *intention* which implies *criminality of the deepest dye*,

the Bishop should himself interpolate an article not to be found in the passage which he quotes? Yet so it is. The Improved Version has it, "He shall be great, and shall be called Son of the Most High:" which would have also been the best mode of rendering verse 36, 'He shall be called Son of God.'

When the Bishop of Raphoe writes a commentary on 1 Cor. xiii., in order to justify himself, he must prove, (which he may do in the same way that he *proves* many other things,) that Charity 'hopeth all things' and 'believeth all things' *which are injurious to an obnoxious sect or an obnoxious individual.*

II. JOHN i. 12.—*Postscript*, p. 51 [515].

Here the Improved Version translates *ἐξουσία*, *authority*. It might have been still better rendered *privilege*,—'To as many as received him gave he the privilege of becoming children of God: '* but as far as this passage is concerned, it is a question of minute verbal criticism, on which I venture to pronounce, in opposition to Bishop Magee, that no

* The Bishop cannot object to my using here the word *privilege*; since he gives (p. 55,) as what would have enabled the "Unitarian Editors" "to learn the true meaning of *ἐξουσία*," the following *Note* from Bishop Pearce, on John i. 12: "The word "*ἐξουσία* signifies *power* in general; sometimes a *natural* power, "sometimes a *usurped* power, and sometimes a power *given by* "human or divine laws: and in this last case it is best rendered by "a *right* or *privilege*, as it should be in 1 Cor. ix. 4, 5, 6, and per- "haps, in Matt. vii. 29, and Mark i. 22." Indeed, what Bishop Magee does not tell us, Bishop Pearce, in the *Commentary*, says, in reference to the word *power* in the Public Version of John i. 12, "Rather, a *right* or *privilege*."

doctrinal principle of *Unitarianism* can possibly be rested. Whatever *power, authority, or privilege, Christ* could give to his disciples, no one can doubt that *God*, even the Father, could communicate it to *him*, and enable him to give it to those who received him. And we have his own authority for saying, that **OF HIMSELF** *he could do nothing*:—‘I can of mine own self do nothing.’ John v. 19, 30.

In the passage under consideration, Newcome follows the Public Version in rendering *ἐξουσία*, *power*: and the offence of the Editors of the Improved Version, (I use the plural form in compliance with custom,) consists in omitting to notice their variation from their basis. If Bishop Magee had been satisfied with charging them with some degree of *negligence*, I might, in their name, have admitted that he was right. But when he labours to impress his Readers with a conviction, (which surely is not in his own mind,) that *the Editors had* **SINISTER objects in view in the omission**, he leaves every principle of equity out of view, and I need not attempt to confute him. The charge is palpably absurd and groundless. In such a case, (even if they were not incapable of fraud in any,) no possible motive can be discovered for fraudulent intention.

The way in which the Bishop endeavours to effect his purpose, is remarkable. The Improved Version “**UNACKNOWLEDGEDLY**” leaves Newcome in a point of no doctrinal moment whatever; and, in translating the same word, in a passage of real moment in the Unitarian controversy, they depart from Newcome with due acknowledgement of the departure. What

the two cases have to do with each other does not appear. There is merely a verbal connection: but the Bishop's object evidently is, to give the impression, that the *unacknowledged* departure is important, because the acknowledged one is. What reasoning!

This second passage is John x. 18. The Bishop says a great deal respecting the Unitarians' criticisms upon it; and, in the course of his strictures, he shows how little confidence is to be placed in *his* citations of Schleusner. It is in this part of his work that, after a flagrant abuse of Schleusner's authority, he charges Mr. Belsham with "FALSIFYING the authority to which he refers," with "GROSS FALSIFICATION," and, virtually, "with DIRECT and DELIBERATE FALSEHOOD:" and then declares that the mode of quotation which has called down these heavy charges, is "the PREVAILING PRACTICE WITH UNITARIAN WRITERS."

If these charges are well-founded, *great CRIMINALITY rests with us*. If they are made falsely, how much has the Bishop to answer for! The case is an important one, and I must enter upon it; but it will be most convenient to make it a separate article; and if the Reader will consult *Appendix B.*, he will find an examination of Dr. Magee's strictures on our criticisms respecting the text referred to, John x. 18.

III. JOHN iii. 13.—P. 76 [540].

In this third *specimen*, the inaccuracy of the Editors, in the use of their symbols, has given their

accuser some advantage. In Newcome's Revision and the Improved Version, words which, in the judgment of Griesbach, *are probably to be expunged*, are included in brackets. Newcome renders the last clause of the verse (see p. 313) "who was in heaven," without any indication, to which his plan did not lead him, that its authority is *somewhat* doubtful: the Improved Version renders it, "who is in heaven," in which rendering of ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, if it err, (which I think it does not,) it errs with the Public Version; and it places the clause in brackets. If in Griesbach's second edition, = the corresponding mark of omission had been employed, the Editors would have been justified in using the brackets, without any reference to Newcome; because the brackets are to be regarded as indicating not Newcome's but Griesbach's opinion.

The fact is, however, that Griesbach prefixes to the clause in brackets, not = but —, indicating a lower degree of suspiciousness.* With this, the brackets should not have been employed; because a definite meaning is attached to them, corresponding in all cases to Griesbach's =, denoting probable omission.—Regretting these occasional inaccuracies vastly more more than Dr. Magee does, I nevertheless feel a confidence, and I should suppose that he

* The following is Griesbach's own statement, *Proleg.* p. xcii. (1796.)

" = indicat probabilem omissionem, neque tamen adeo certam, ut nullus dubitationi locus supersit."

" — præfigitur verbis quorum ommissio minus est probabilis."

does also, that they were, in the strictest sense, *inadvertencies*: and *he* only will visit the Editors with severity of censure, who is unacquainted with the difficulty of obtaining that *technical* precision, which is necessary for minute and uniform accuracy. Archbishop Newcome would not have so visited them. "On examining my book since it was printed," says the ingenuous Primate, "I find that I have sometimes "inattentively departed from this rule," viz. *respecting the use of the brackets*. Who, on this account, would have charged the venerable Critic with wrong intention? Who, besides the Bishop of Raphoe, and those who prostrate their understandings before his powerful assertions, would so charge the Editors of the Improved Version?

The Bishop's capitals (p. 313) represent two *un-
known departures* from Newcome in this verse; viz. HATH ASCENDED for GOETH, and is for WAS. The first departure is acknowledged: the second is the only offence against Newcome. No doubt the variation should have been acknowledged; but he who understands the case, and still believes that the omission of acknowledgment was *intentional*, and to *serve a purpose*, must have an intellect well prepared to embrace the mysteries of the Athanasian Creed.

The Bishop's principal purpose of noticing the omission must surely have been, to have a text for a series of unwieldy notes respecting some interpretations of the passages usually supposed to teach our Lord's pre-existence. My object, in this work, does not embrace the defence of such interpretations as I do myself regard as just. If Providence preserve me

the ability for the revisal of my *Unitarianism &c.*, I propose to consider, as far as is necessary for the justification of my own interpretations, the arguments brought against them by Dr. Nares, Bishop Magee, Bishop Burgess, Dr. Hales, and Dean (now I believe Bishop) Graves. I think, too, that I shall be able to modify some and to elucidate others, so as to render them more satisfactory, at least to myself. But I am solicitous that it should be clearly understood, that “*the question of ATONEMENT,*” as Bishop Magee terms it, is *really* INDEPENDENT of the doctrine of simple PRE-EXISTENCE; and that this doctrine is held by many who are as consistent, as any believer in the Simple Humanity of our Lord, in the EXCLUSIVE WORSHIP of GOD even the FATHER, and in recognizing HIS ESSENTIAL, UNPURCHASED, UNIVERSAL LOVE AND MERCY TOWARDS MANKIND. He who is thus consistent, because he believes that the FATHER, JEHOVAH, is the ONE and ONLY GOD, (whether or not he believes in the Simple Humanity of Christ,) is a UNITARIAN.

Some of Bishop Magee’s misrepresentations in this part of his *Postscript*, I have already noticed in Chap. V.; and as to those singular specimens of his logical skill, by which he proposes (p. 87) to make the Reader “a little better acquainted with the *absurdity of the criticisms, and the incompetency of the Critics,*” I have no desire to do more, than request the Reader to peruse what “Mr. Belsham and Dr. Carpenter” have themselves said, and judge for himself.

IV. Rom. ix. 5.—*Postscript*, p. 99 [563].

The Bishop's next citation from the passages in which these men "of scanty learning and dishonest criticism," have "UNACKNOWLEDGEDLY" departed from their basis, respects a very important passage. That the Reader may have the matter clearly before him, I will again quote the citation, as already given, among others, in p. 313.

IV.—Rom. ix. 5.—N.—"*Whose are the fathers, and of whom, AS CONCERNING THE FLESH, Christ came, WHO IS OVER ALL, GOD BLESSED for ever, AMEN.*"—I. V.—"*Whose are the fathers, and of whom, BY NATURAL DESCENT, Christ came. GOD, WHO IS OVER ALL, BE BLESSED for ever.*"

I have only to add, that this is cited among the "*specimens*" "*of important, UNACKNOWLEDGED departures from Newcome's Version.*"

Now let me beg the Reader to consider, whether he did not understand the Bishop to charge the Editors of the Improved Version with *not acknowledging* those variations from Newcome which he has printed in small capitals? and whether, therefore, as far as he depended upon the Bishop of Raphoe's fidelity, he did not *believe* that the Editors have neglected to say, that the Primate follows the common rendering of the passage? Without a doubt, numbers have believed this,—relying on testimony which, *à priori*, no one would question, but which, in reality, some unhappy perversion of mind has made, in a multitude of instances, utterly fallacious.

The truth is, the *first* departure from Newcome, "BY NATURAL DESCENT," is *not* noticed: but of what moment is this variation in the controversy, (though

the Bishop speaks of it magnificently, as what “ could “ not have been made without the *fullest deliberation* “ *and design*,”) that, even had the Editors been *capable* of the “ SHAMEFUL DISINGENUOUSNESS ” charged upon them, could have induced them to violate *intentionally* a principle which they themselves laid down for scrupulous observance ?

But the important point is, the Editors *do EXPRESSLY state*, that Newcome here adopts the common rendering, “ WHO IS OVER ALL, GOD BLESSED for ever.” Whether Bishop Magee knew this when he sent to the press the bill of indictment which I have quoted (p. 313) I cannot tell ; but he knew it when he sent it forth into the world : for, *above a hundred pages* from the accusation itself, at the end of his copious remarks on the text, extending through twenty-eight pages mostly filled with closely printed notes, he lets his Readers know the truth,—that *this*, the only *material* variation, *the Editors HAVE noticed as they ought*.—Why did not the Bishop, for his own sake, cancel the previous statement so discreditable to his fidelity and ingenuousness ?

If any fresh arguments were adduced by Bishop Magee, against the mode of rendering this passage which the Unitarians generally adopt, I would examine them : but the whole is *assertion* ; and that assertion is, p. 117 [581], that “ the objections urged “ by Dr. Middleton, and since enforced by Mr. Veysie “ and Dr. Nares ” “ are, and must be allowed by “ every Greek scholar to be, incontrovertible.” As the Bishop, in the next page, allows Mr. Wakefield

to have been a "Greek scholar," I place his concession, (quoted, strange to say, in this next page,) that "*the original will certainly admit*" this construction, (which, however, he thinks awkward, abrupt, and incoherent,) against the Bishop's random assertion.*

* When Dr. Magee cited Mr. Wakefield's *Inquiry*, against the Unitarians, he might have added the two following facts. (1) That Mr. Wakefield, in his *Inquiry*, is of opinion, that, following the present text, the Apostle speaks of *Christ as God over all*, "inasmuch as he is constituted our chief *Ruler*, the only *Legislator*, and the final *Judge*, of the body of his Church."—*Inq.* p. 165. (2) That he is favourable to the conjectural transposition of Slichtingius; and thinks "there are some very probable reasons" for believing that the Apostle wrote $\omega\nu\ \delta$, instead of $\delta\ \omega\nu$.—His reasons would deserve consideration, if the present reading admitted of no justifiable rendering, in consistency with the grand and decisive declaration of the Apostle himself in 1 Cor. viii. 6, and the still more important expression of our Lord in John xvii. 3. But I am not disposed to give any weight to that which is founded upon the completion of the climax. St. Paul might well say that, as far as respects natural descent, the Messiah sprang from the stock of Israelites: but I do not perceive with what pertinency the Apostle of the Gentiles could represent Him who is rich in mercy unto *all* who call upon Him, as peculiarly the God of that people who had crucified His Beloved Son, and who, by their disobedience, had thrown off their peculiar relation to Him. (I perceive that Bishop Middleton adduces a similar argument, and conclusively refers to Rom. iii. 29.) As to the former part of the verse, no doubt, if $\omega\nu\ \delta$ were the original reading, the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ must have been afterwards inserted; and it is wanting in some ancient authorities.

I see no adequate reason for admitting the conjectural reading of Slichtingius; but when Bishop Magee condescends to represent Mr. Belsham as ignorant that $\omega\nu$ is not the participle, because, through some error which those who conduct works through the press can easily understand, the *Calm Inquiry* (but not the *Improved Version*) represents the present reading as $\delta\ \omega\nu$ instead of

Bishop Middleton brings forward but one objection against *our* construction, (which is altogether independent of Locke's;) and that one, I am fully satisfied, for the reasons assigned in *Unitarianism &c.*,

ὁ ων,—and when he attempts to ground an argument to the same effect on Mr. Belsham's speaking of the alteration requiring (as it really does) the transposition of only a single letter,—he deserves no reply.

It deserves to be recorded, however, that the *British Critic*, in the article already referred to (p. 16), *presumes* “with considerable hesitation” “to differ from a writer of *such* ACKNOWLEDGED ACCURACY as the reverend dignitary before us, *who takes nothing upon trust, and adopts nothing RASHLY or HASTILY.*”^{*}—The Bishop founds an argument upon the probable presence of the aspirate in MSS. of the apostolical age: the Critic, who certainly has much more scholarship than gentlemanly liberality, adduces the fact that, from the MSS. discovered in the ruins of Herculaneum, it does not appear that the aspirate H was then in use.

I might say much in connection with Dr. Magee's other charges against the accuracy of Mr. Belsham, contained in his notes on this passage. On some points, for want of the power to refer to several of the Authors whom he cites, I am unable to examine him: but on two I can speak decidedly. The first is, that though Mr. Belsham has not given Dr. Clarke's opinion with complete precision, yet that his position is not “*substantially* untrue,” but, in the *essential* point, perfectly correct, viz. that Clarke regarded θεος as of doubtful authority: indeed Clarke goes so far as to say (in his Letter to the Rev. Mr. R. M., *Works*, vol. iv. p. 369,) “that the word *God* is wanting here in many of the most ancient MSS. ;” which, however, is very erroneous. The second point is, that it is “*substantially* untrue” to assert, as Bishop Magee does, that the Editors would reject this word, and require their Readers to

* If the critique had not been marked with low abuse of Mr. Belsham, and fulsome adulation of Dr. Magee, one might have reasonably supposed that the Reviewer was here indulging himself in irony.

p. 134, is without any solid foundation. These reasons, (though Bishop Magee speaks of Dr. Carpenter *labouring to varnish the matter*, and therefore knew of them,) he has not examined; and from his thus passing them by with the simple denial, I presume he was not disposed to undertake the refutation of them.*

consider it as of doubtful authority. Mr. Belsham's statements respect merely the opinion of others.

If the Bishop have discovered some inaccuracy in the statements of the *Calm Inquiry* and the *Improved Version* on this text, what has he discovered which will bear the slightest comparison with the enormous and continual errors of which I have shown him to be guilty? And yet, in consequence of them, he charges Mr. Belsham, &c. with an "ABUSE of *authorities*" employed *without shame or scruple*, "with the COOL and DELIBERATE purpose of FALSIFYING the WORD OF GOD."!!! See above, p. 244.

* At the close of the last Note, I referred to Bishop Magee's charge concerning "abuse of authorities." On the passage before us, as well as various other parts, he is himself really guilty of it, in reference to WHITBY. He frequently cites him against the Unitarians; but I cannot find that he has ever once intimated, that this eminent Critic expressly retracted several of his strongest statements in favour of the Trinitarian interpretations. In his *Last Thoughts*, "published by his express order," he strongly and distinctly maintains the Absolute Oneness of the Godhead, and the Unrivalled Supremacy of the Father; and his *Commentary* should never have been republished without this very able and interesting tract. At any rate we may justly maintain, that his *Commentary* should never be cited, *as authority*, in cases where Whitby has expressly declared, in his Ὑστεραι Φροντιδες, that he had before been in an error. The Title-page represents the book as "containing his CORRECTION of several passages in his *Commentary on the New Testament*;" and he begins his Second Part thus: "I proceed now to

The common rendering, *as far as the Greek merely is concerned*, is justifiable : so also is that of the Unitarians. And *we* follow that, which makes the Apostle

expound some passages of Scripture, which *seem to have been misunderstood by most modern Expositors, and sometimes also BY MYSELF.*"

I must offer the Reader a few passages from the Preface, as the work is now unfortunately scarce.

" When I wrote my *Commentaries on the New Testament*, I went
 " on (too hastily I own) in the common beaten road of other re-
 " puted *Orthodox* divines : conceiving, *first*, that the Father, Son,
 " and Holy Ghost, in one complex notion, were one and the
 " same God, by virtue of the same *individual* essence communi-
 " cated from the Father. This confused notion, I am now fully
 " convinced, by the arguments I have offered here, and in the
 " second part of my Reply to *Dr. Waterland*, to be a thing impos-
 " sible, and full of gross *absurdities*, and *contradictions*."

" All other notions of the word *Person*, besides the plain and
 " obvious one, signifying a real and intelligent Agent, have been
 " already so excellently baffled and learnedly confuted, that I own
 " I am not able to resist the shining evidence of truth : nor am I
 " ashamed to confess my former *mistakes* and *errors* in these mat-
 " ters, after such strong and irresistible conviction, seeing, *Hu-*
 " *manum est errare*, all men are liable to error. And as, upon this
 " principle, I cannot but think it the most gross hypocrisy, after
 " such conviction, to persist in a mistake ; so, without question, it
 " is the greatest abuse of humility and free thinking, to attribute
 " such open and ingenuous acknowledgements to a wavering
 " judgment, or levity of mind."

" This my *Retraction*, or change of my opinion, after all my
 " former endeavours to assert and establish a contrary doctrine,
 " deserves the more to be considered, because it proceeds (and
 " indeed *can* proceed) from me for no other reason, but purely
 " from the strong and irresistible convictions, which are now
 " upon me, that I *was mistaken*."

" Nothing, I say, but the love of truth can be supposed to

agree with himself, and agree also with him who called him to preach the Gospel, and directed his

“ extort such a *Retractation* from me, who, having already lived so
 “ long beyond the common period of life, can have nothing else
 “ to do but to prepare for my great change; and in order there-
 “ unto to make my peace with God, and my own Conscience,
 “ before I die. To this purpose I solemnly appeal to the Searcher
 “ of Hearts, and call God to witness, whether I have *hastily* or
 “ *rashly* departed from the common opinion; or rather, whether
 “ I have not *deliberately* and *calmly* weighed the arguments on
 “ both sides, drawn from Scripture and Antiquity?

“ As I have no views for this world, so it cannot be imagined
 “ that the motives drawn from interest, ambition, or secular glory,
 “ can have any place with me. Or if I had, neither can it be
 “ imagined that I would choose to dissent from the received
 “ opinion, the maintainers whereof are they who grasp honours
 “ and preferments, and think they have the best title to those
 “ advantages.”

“ So that upon the whole, if I have erred in changing my opi-
 “ nion, I desire it may be observed, that my error hath neither
 “ prejudice nor secular views to support it: and that my mistake
 “ (if such it will be reputed) hath been all along attended with
 “ constant prayers to the Throne of Grace, and what hath alway
 “ appeared to me to be the strongest reason and most undeniable
 “ evidence.”—*Preface to Whitby's Last Thoughts.*

Noble, upright Confessor!—“ It is remarkable,” says the learned Bishop of St. David's, “ that Whiston's defection to the Baptists,
 “ WHITBY'S declension from Orthodoxy, and the last alterations in
 “ the *Theory of Religion*,” referring to Bishop Law's relinquishing the doctrine of Pre-existence, “ all took place in the EXTREME
 “ DECAY of life.” I hope, for the credit of his judgment, that the Bishop never read the ὕστεραι φροντίδες. But perhaps he did not mean the extreme decay of UNDERSTANDING. At least none is manifested in the work. It displays abundantly the vigour of a sound intellect, and the ardour of an honest love of truth.—Bishop Burgess censures Mr. Belsham for the publication of a Letter from

labours. The common rendering is in direct contradiction with the plain, express, and repeated declarations of both.

V. 2 COR. viii. 9.—*Postscript*, p. 129 [593].

On the point for which, in the first instance, this passage was adduced, Bishop Magee is in the right. The Improved Version does not notice the variation of its rendering from that of Newcome.—I will not here go over again the ground already trodden; but simply say that, while I regret the omission, I am certain—I hope the Bishop is not, and yet I know not why he should not,—that it was utterly unintentional. The variety of objects to which the principal Editor had to direct his attention, in preparing the work, and conducting it through the press, must prevent those who can understand the real state of the case from visiting the omission with too severe a censure.

Respecting the interpretation of the passage, I have nothing to say here. The Bishop's arguments scarcely affect my own view of its import. If I execute the intention more than once adverted to, I will re-examine, and, if necessary, will notice, all in his long discussion which really affects the question. It has nothing to do with the principal object of this work. The doctrine of Pre-existence (as I have

the Bishop of Elphin to Mr. Lindsey: if there were in this any indelicacy, which I cannot perceive, is it to be compared to that of such an insinuation as the above, respecting his excellent Father, the Bishop of Carlisle?

often said) is held by many Unitarians; and in the simple form in which, if at all, it can be presented by this passage, it in no way affords any grounds for decision as to the *ends* of the death of Christ.

I do not, on every point, accord with Mr. Belsham's criticisms on this passage, particularly as respects the *unequivocal* import of the Greek: but few persons, I conceive, of common learning and candour, who, after the perusal of Bishop Magee's strictures, should examine Mr. Belsham's statements on the subject, would hesitate in allowing, that these have been most egregiously misrepresented.—Why cannot this learned Disputant, if he believes that he has truth on his side, and that the arguments of his opponents are weak and futile, combat them with more honourable weapons?

I will furnish the Reader with one or two specimens of his mode of conducting the argument: and he may perceive that it is in vain to expect fairness from Bishop Magee, when he is endeavouring to trample down the Unitarian; and that he who wishes to know what the Unitarian really says, must not trust to the Bishop's representations.

“He,” the Calm Inquirer, “tells us,” says the Bishop, p. 131 [595], “that, unless we are dreaming we must admit that the text means nothing more than to inform us, of ‘A MAN WHO, THOUGH HE WAS RICH, SPENT NOTHING,’ of a mere ‘MISER.’” It strikes me forcibly that, to this assertion of the Bishop, his own censure (p. 206) is fully applicable. “*Literæ non erubescunt*, is an old saying. “*There are things which a man may write, which*

“ he could not easily command countenance to say.”

Is it possible that Dr. Magee could believe that Mr. Belsham tells us any such thing? At any rate, Mr. Belsham does not. If the Reader will consult the *Calm Inquiry*, p. 122, he will perceive that he does not;* and if he will read on to p. 126, he will find what Mr. Belsham really tells us the text does mean. It is as follows:

“ The interpretation of Grotius and others, adopted by Mr. Lindsey, is more to the Apostle’s purpose. Jesus Christ was rich in miraculous powers, which it was at his option to employ for his own benefit. He fed the multitude; he brought miraculous draughts of fishes into the net; he paid tribute by miracle; and by miracle he supplied a wedding-feast with wine. With equal ease he could have supplied himself and his friends with all the comforts, the conveniences, and the elegancies of life. He was rich—but he lived in poverty. He made no use of his miraculous powers for his own advantage. He subsisted upon the liberality of his followers, and had not where to lay his head.

* Perhaps the Reader may wish to have Mr. Belsham’s statements before him; and I will copy them.

“ No person, whose mind was not wholly pre-occupied with a persuasion of the pre-existence of Christ, would ever dream of finding it in this text. If the fact were antecedently established, this passage might indeed be admitted as a graceful allusion to it: but it never can with any propriety be alleged as a proof. For when it is said of any man, that though he is rich he spends nothing, who in his senses infers from it that he existed before he was born? Upon this principle, every miser would have a claim to pre-existence.”—*Calm Inquiry*, p. 122.

I do not think the illustration a happy one; but it is introduced merely as an *illustration*, and, as Dr. Magee well knows, not as the *meaning* of the text.

“ From kindness and for the sake of his followers, he submitted to these privations, to set them a memorable example of fortitude, of resignation, of self-denial, for the benefit of others.

“ ‘ That they through his poverty might be *rich*.’ Here the connexion requires that the word should be taken in a figurative sense: rich in faith, in holiness, in benevolence, and in the promises and blessings of the Gospel. How admirably calculated such an argument was to excite a spirit of compassion for the poor, of gratitude, of kindness and generosity, and of active persevering benevolence, it is unnecessary to remark. It speaks for itself”.—*Calm Inquiry*, p. 126.

Upon a similar system of controversy, Bishop Magee informs his Readers, p. 205 [669], that “ we “ are told by him ” (Mr. Belsham) “ and his brother “ Editors, that the true construction of the passage “ in Philippians ” (ch. ii. 6—8) “ is, that *this appearance was to continue, whilst nothing appeared*.” The Bishop does not give this as a quotation, (though he places it, as I have done, in Italics,) but he asserts that Mr. Belsham and his brother Editors *tell* us so. His Readers will do well not to repeat the charge upon the Bishop’s authority. If they examine the Improved Version and the *Calm Inquiry* for themselves, they will be more likely to know the truth. “ On this “ text,” says the Bishop, “ Mr. Belsham has expended seventeen close and heavy pages: * and after

* The Bishop’s remarks on 2 Cor. viii. 9, and his connected criticism on Phil. ii. 6—8, extend through *seventy-eight* pages, above half of which are filled with closely printed Notes. One great difference between Mr. Belsham’s pages and the Bishop’s, consists

“ great labour of Metaphysics and Philology, (*such*
 “ Metaphysics and *such* Philology as fall to the lot
 “ of a *certain* tribe of Writers,) he has brought the
 “ whole matter to this simple point ;” viz. “ *this ap-*
 “ *pearance was to continue, whilst nothing appeared.*”

I sometimes can make out what it is that suggests Bishop Magee’s wonderful statements ; but here I declare myself at a loss to comprehend to what he refers. The Reader may be more successful ; and I will therefore quote the summary which Mr. Belsham himself gives at the conclusion of the seventeen pages.

“ According to this interpretation, the exaltation of Christ consists in his possession of a divine commission and voluntary miraculous powers. His humiliation consists in neglecting to use those powers for his own benefit, in submitting to a humble, laborious, and dependent condition, and finally, in resigning himself to suffering and death in obedience to the will of God, and for the good of mankind.

“ Thus this celebrated text, admitting of a fair interpretation consistently with the proper humanity of Jesus Christ, if not decisive in favour of this doctrine, may at least be regarded as neutral. It is one of those passages of which no use can be made in deciding the controversy.”—*Calm Inquiry*, p. 144.

in this : the former are filled with luminous statements and arguments, the object of which no one can doubt, whether he is convinced by them or not ; and all distinctly bearing on that object : Bishop Magee, on the other hand, seems to have given the Public all his first thoughts, without any attempt at arrangement ; and has so expanded them by his general diffuseness and repetition, that it is not easy, even for the patient Reader, to know whereabouts he is in the labyrinth.

VI. HEBR. xiii. 25, 26.—*Postscript*, p. 207 [672].

The Bishop's remarks on this text open with strong language. Here, he says, "we find, not only a total " departure from the Primate's translation, but an " *actual FABRICATION of Scripture.*"

I request the Reader to turn back to p. 314, where he will find the quotations from Newcome and the Improved Version exactly as they are given by the Bishop. I beg him to observe that this is cited as one specimen among others of *important UNACKNOWLEDGED departures* from Newcome; and I beg him farther to observe the manner in which the word God is printed in the extract from the Improved Version.

I will suppose a person, depending upon the Bishop of Raphoe's veracity *and* accuracy, to have formed his opinion from the comparison I have referred to. He necessarily believes that, *without acknowledging the change*, the Improved Version has transformed the Primate's HIM into God; and, what is more, that they have done this without authority from the Greek, and without the usual and universally understood indication that the word is supplied by the Translator. And if he does so, he believes what is absolutely without foundation: for, first, the variation in *this* clause is expressly noticed; and, secondly, the word supplied is noticed just as it ought to be.

An inquirer unacquainted with those "arts of controversy" of which Bishop Magee's work presents so many melancholy specimens, might suppose that, while bringing forward such heavy charges as he urges against the Editors, he would take care himself

to be accurate, and say only the thing which is: at any rate, that he would bring no charge which he did not believe to be true: nor exaggerate what he thought to be well founded. Two hundred pages after the bill of indictment which I have cited in p. 314, he states these essential facts; first, that the supplement is printed (*God*) as it ought to be; and secondly, that *this* variation from Newcome is acknowledged.

That the remaining alterations in the verse, made to render the subsequent parts accordant with the first clause, are unnoticed, is true; and certainly is to be regretted: but all the twisting energies of this skilful Polemic will be insufficient to present even a plausible proof that the neglect was intentional.

If any one attempt to defend the Bishop on the ground that, as it respects part of the verse, the Bishop has given the truth, he cannot go farther and add that he has declared the whole truth and nothing but the truth.—I will not say that I write this with no mixture of indignant feeling: but it is not under the impulse of such a feeling, that I have formed my judgment of Bishop Magee's controversial character. It is my serious deliberate conviction, that he is repeatedly guilty of flagrant injustice, and of such systematic and frequent misrepresentation, as, with the utmost willingness to do it, I am unable to bring under the head of inadvertency.

But to return—The original is *τον λαλουντα*, *the speaker*, or *him that speaketh*; and there is no ancient authority which introduces the *name* of the speaker.—Because the Improved Version has “*God* who

speaketh," the Bishop says, " here there is a direct fabrication of the word ' God,' and a gross imposition upon the Reader."* Most persons would have deemed it sufficient, that by printing this word in *Italics*, the Editors expressly represented that it is not in the original, but is supplied to complete what they thought the sense: but the Bishop absolutely declares that this " is but a *poor evasion*." The assertion is too absurd to require confutation. This is the legitimate, the exclusive mode, of indicating what the Editors *intended* to indicate, that the word *God* is without a corresponding word in the original, but inserted to complete what they deemed the sense. In this very verse, the venerable Primate has himself, according to Dr. Magee's singular nomenclature, **FABRICATED** the word *God*; and I know not how the Bishop will deny that the Translators of the Public Version have *fabricated* the same word in Acts vii. 59, and even in 1 John iii. 16.

These supplements fall more within the province of the Commentator than that of the Translator; and till a greater agreement has been obtained as to the sense of disputed passages of Scripture, it is best for the Translator to leave in them, if possible, the indefiniteness of the original. This I would have done in the present instance; and against introducing

* I must offer a few remarks on the use made by Bishop Magee of the Unitarian Reviewer's statements respecting the variations of the Improved Version from Griesbach's Text; and on the system adopted respecting the Greek Text, by some recent Critics and Editors. For these I beg to refer the Reader to *Appendix C*.

any supplement in the text, Bishop Magee might have fairly objected. But to talk of this supplement being “a FABRICATION of Scripture,” and, though noticed *in its legitimate form* as a supplement, to charge the Editors (p. 223) with INVENTING “a new text for the translation,” as well *inventing* “a new translation for the text,” must in my judgment be regarded as a complete proof, that he found he had very little on which to rest any solid charges against the Editors.

A similar charge of FABRICATION is made against the Editors, because, in their *Note* on 1 Cor. x. 9, they adopted Newcome’s *interpretation*: and connected with the Bishop’s criticisms on the text in the Hebrews, is a Note on this passage, extending through eighteen pages, on which, especially as the Bishop has implicated me a little, I think it desirable to offer a few remarks in the Appendix.—See *App. D.*

We have now gone through the six *Specimens* (p. 313) adduced by the Bishop, “of IMPORTANT UNACKNOWLEDGED departures from Newcome’s Version.” In the 5th (p. 329), he has, on this score, an undisputed advantage over the Editors: in the 6th (p. 334), though the *essential* alteration is acknowledged, through some inadvertency the dependent alterations are not: in the 3d (p. 318), the Improved Version has taken the rendering of the Public Version, (in which surely there is no great criminality,) but leaves Newcome without notice: in the 1st and 2d (pp. 314, 316), are two unnoticed variations, (the one in an article, the other in a single word,) both of

which must appear, to every one who does not read with prejudice of a highly magnifying power, to be of no importance in the Unitarian controversy : and the 4th (p. 322) contains an unnoticed variation, itself of little moment, but connected with one of very great moment ; which last, *though it is duly noticed in the Improved Version*, is so stated by the Bishop, (as are also one or more others,) that the unsuspecting Reader is necessarily and egregiously misled as to the truth of the case.—If the Bishop of Raphoe can find, in any Unitarian Writer, a statement bearing, as much as this 4th count of his indictment does, the characters of “dishonest controversy,” (I use his own words in reference to Mr. Belsham,) I am content to give him up, whatever his talents or his influence. He will find nothing of the kind in the writings of Mr. Belsham. And to the characteristics of the charge itself, must be added the obvious fact, that it was adduced in order to bear down one whose reputation, (even respecting *moral* character,) if it rested on the gross asserions of his opponent,* would be gone for ever.

If any thing can surpass it, it is the declaration, that the foregoing are but *specimens*. Dr. Magee adduces them as proofs of the “disingenuous use of the name of Archbishop Newcome” made by the Unitarian Editors : and he declares that his “examples and proofs in support of the allegation,” are “*selected from an ample and disgusting abundance.*”—On this point, “the disingenuous use of the name of Archbishop Newcome,” he must have derived all his

* See above, p. 107, 243, 247.

information (directly or indirectly) from the Unitarian Reviewer: and the Unitarian Reviewer, of whose information he has made so unjustifiable a use, now tells the Bishop of Raphoe, (on the strength of the *evidence*, the whole substance of which the Reader will find in Appendix A,) that he has done his worst; that he selected those examples which most served his purpose; that he has passed by those which would have proved, to every equitable judge, that his charge of “artifice and dishonesty” is as groundless as it is gross; and that those which he has selected, he has employed for a purpose which must grieve his own friends, and the friends of his cause, in proportion as they understand its real character and the means by which he has endeavoured to effect it.

The Bishop thus proceeds, immediately after the passage cited in the last paragraph:

“And if, whilst I have been employed in establishing this charge, evidence has arisen, of **ARTIFICE**, and **DISHONESTY**, not only in their application of the Primate’s name, but in their treatment of other authorities, bearing on those parts of Scripture which vitally affect the Unitarian question: if, in their exposition of those parts of Scripture, numerous instances have appeared, of **FALSEHOODS** *in quotation*, of fallacies and blunders in reasoning, of rashness and ignorance in criticism, of confidence in assumption, of unblushing hardihood in assertion; in a word, of all the various *means*, and *contrivances*, by which, **BAD FAITH**, *unchecked by learning, and unabashed by SHAME*, is used to mislead the uninformed, and delude the *unsuspecting*: I trust, also, that I shall stand acquitted of improper severity, in the terms, in which the charge was originally expressed; and that, what the Editors, in the person of the *Calm Inquirer*, (who is acknowledged as their advocate,) have

complained of as *coarse language*, the Reader will admit to be nothing more than the language of plain truth : and that he will be disposed to offer for me the apology that Philip did for those who are described as being in the habit of calling a spade a spade."—*Postscript*, p. 259 [723].

Certainly if the Bishop had really adduced evidence of the nature he has described, no severity he *could* employ would be too severe. I have minutely followed him through his most plausible and weighty charges against Mr. Belsham, both in the *Postscript* and in the preceding volumes ; and my own deliberate conviction is, that they are destitute of all real weight ; that their plausibility depends on the exaggerated representations he has given of errors of inadvertency, which might be pointed out in his own work (if these have no worse character) in numbers ten-fold, or on gross misrepresentations of the unguarded positions, or false quotations of the words, of those whom he is endeavouring to crush ; that he has repeatedly employed " means and contrivances " which nothing can vindicate ; and that in the employment of them, more especially in the *Postscript*, he appears to be influenced by a spirit of personal revenge, and of intolerant bigotry, which would have better suited the age when persecution wielded different but not more injurious weapons. The Bishop has done all that lay in his power to wound Mr. Belsham in his reputation, his usefulness, and his peace.

With this Chapter, I gladly end my exposure and censure of Bishop Magee's system of personal controversy. I have still left unnoticed various assertions

and expressions marked with the same characters of which I have already adduced so many indications : but I have surely said enough to prove, that the Bishop of Raphoe is not one on whom the wise and liberal opponent of Unitarianism may rely with confidence ; and I will conclude this portion of my work, with some observations on the *beneficial tendency* of Unitarianism. In doing this, I shall confine myself to those points in which all my Unitarian brethren may unite. Myself a firm believer in the the 'proper humanity of Christ, I might add the peculiar moral advantages which arise from that doctrine, especially as they concern the Character of Christ, and the grounds of Love to him. Another opportunity may occur, however, of entering upon these points ; and I the more willingly pass them by in this place, because I can refer the Reader, with complete satisfaction, to Two Discourses by the Rev, W. Turner, of Newcastle : " I. On the Fitness and Propriety of the Gospel Dispensation being introduced through the Medium of the MAN Christ Jesus ; and II. On the Foundation, Nature, and Proper Expressions, of Love to the Lord Jesus Christ." These Discourses are among the numerous proofs that Bishop Magee does not understand Unitarianism.

CHAPTER IX.

ON THE BENEFICIAL TENDENCY OF UNITARIANISM.

It has been sometimes urged against the doctrines of Unitarianism, that they cannot be true, because their effects are bad. Those who have made the objection, do not argue fairly : they do not fairly ascertain the fact ; and they do not take into account those other causes which may operate to produce the effects which they erroneously attribute to Unitarianism.

I say they do not fairly ascertain the fact,—that what they deem its effects are real, or, if real, that they are bad. Sometimes they set up as a standard of Christian practice, and as a test of Christian principle, some criterion which the Gospel neither lays down nor sanctions, and which the Unitarian holds to be perverted or defective ; and then, judging by this, they come to conclusions which are utterly inconsistent with righteous judgment. And, still more frequently, they draw inferences as to the religious conduct of Unitarian professors, from casual expressions in themselves unfounded or entirely misunderstood ; and from a few cases, they form the most erroneous judgments of the religious views and conduct of Unitarians generally.*

* Some facts bearing on this position, have been already stated in the Note beginning in p. 86. I may here mention another. A

If any opinions naturally lead to a perversion or deficiency in Christian duty, then the conduct of those who profess them may be regarded as a strong corroborative proof of their injurious tendency. But if the opinions have naturally no such tendency, the ill-conduct of those who hold them must be assigned to some other cause. Our Lord does indeed say, that the tree is known by its fruits; but, to apply the principle, we must not take the tree which does not bear the fruits. If a man's spirit and conduct be unchristian, his actuating principles must be bad; his heart cannot be right: but his religious sentiments must not be made responsible for his unchristian spirit and conduct, unless it can be shown that they have, in some way or other, led to them.

A man's religious sentiments may be true, without

Minister connected with the moderate Calvinists told me that he had been informed by a Member of a large and important Congregation among the Unitarians, that none of that Congregation maintained Family-Worship. I have had no opportunity of learning what this person really said; but if the Minister understood him correctly, the information he gave was most random and groundless.—No doubt this important practice is too much neglected among us; but is it the Unitarian Minister alone who has to regret the deficiency? Is it not a constant subject of regret among other classes of professed Christians? If, however, we may form a judgment by the number of Family Prayer-Books which have been sold among us, expressly designed for the use of those professing Unitarian sentiments, the proportion who adhere to this almost essential means of cherishing family religion is as great as among religious professors in general. At any rate, by numbers among us it is maintained as it ought to be; and I am certain that there is nothing in Unitarianism to prevent it.

affecting his practice; they may be false, without affecting his practice. Multitudes believe in Christianity, who have nothing of the Christian but the name: multitudes have believed in some of the wildest corruptions of Christianity, who have been Christians in deed and in truth.—As to what I deem the corruptions of Christianity, it may be truly said, that where these unhappily modify the views entertained of Christian duty and the Christian character, yet the grand practical truths of the Gospel have so powerful an influence in the heart which is yielded up to the obedience and imitation of Christ Jesus, which is sincerely desirous to do the will of God, that errors connected with these truths only serve to perplex the understanding, and to play around the heart, without essentially perverting its affections and principles. And on the other hand, where the belief is scriptural, decided, and pure, yet the influence of the world and of bad habits and dispositions formed independently of that belief, as well as other causes which in individual cases are easily ascertained, often prevent its efficacy, and it has little or no share in the regulation of the heart and the guidance of the life.

Some of those circumstances which have tended to excite suspicion against Unitarianism have already been adverted to (see p. 28—36, 67, 88, &c.): I may here add, that many have avowed themselves Unitarians, not from any serious regard to Christian truth and duty, or from serious examination of the evidence on which the doctrines of Unitarianism depend; but because these at once approve themselves to their understanding, and because the Unitarians lay no

undue stress upon the external observances of piety, and none upon those excited states of feeling in which some appear to place the essence of religion. Such persons sometimes have little regard to the practical tendency of the doctrines they profess ; and if Unitarianism do not improve them, they will, in all probability, too often throw discredit upon the cause they avow.

When the Deist urges against us the unchristian lives of professing Christians, we justly answer by inquiring if this is the fault of their religion ; and we desire him to form his estimate of the practical value of Christianity, by its efficacy where the life is cordially and habitually shaped by its precepts, its spirit, its prospects, and its examples. Unitarianism asks for the same justice ; and then it has nothing to fear. The merely speculative Unitarian, whose opinions as little affect his heart as the clothes do which he wears, cannot, with justice, be regarded as a specimen of the influence of Unitarian principles.

The argument from the conduct of those who hold any opinions, to the truth or falsehood of the opinions themselves, is one which requires a judicious acquaintance with the springs of human action, extensive experience, and accurate observation. And even with all these, it can only afford a presumption, which can weigh nothing against direct proofs, and the plain and natural tendency of these opinions.

If I could not perceive as clearly as I do, the beneficial tendency of the great principles of Unitarianism, yet I should not hesitate to maintain it on the two following considerations : (1) That Truth, under the

government of a holy, wise, and benevolent Being, all whose ways are truth, must, on the whole, be more productive of good than error can be: and (2) That our Lord himself, speaking of the FATHER as the ONLY TRUE GOD, represents it as *life eternal* to know Him, and Jesus Christ, whom He sent. In these all-important words, the Unitarian's Creed is comprised; and with the knowledge (undoubtedly the *practical* knowledge) of the truths they contain, our Lord connects eternal life.

But independently of these abstract considerations, I rejoice in the clear perception of its beneficial tendency. I see that Unitarianism embraces all the great motives of Christianity; that it impedes the operation of none; and that it frees the practical principles of the Gospel from the influence of doctrines, which, in their natural efficacy, impede or pervert them.

I. I consider it as a great excellence of UNITARIANISM, that it ENCOURAGES AND REWARDS THE SOUND EXERCISE OF THE UNDERSTANDING IN MATTERS OF RELIGION.—Unitarianism peculiarly falls in with the liberal and intellectual character of the Gospel, and of the instructions of Christ and his Apostles. The religion of Christ is a religion of the heart, but it is also a religion of the understanding. Truth is the food, and divine truth the best food of the understanding: 'to bear witness to the truth,' was the object (our Saviour himself says) 'for which he was born, for which he came forth into the world:' and he prays that by the truth God would sanctify his disciples.

The spirit of the Gospel-dispensation is admirably expressed in the words of the Apostle Paul, (1 Cor. xiv. 15,) ‘ I will pray with the spirit. I will pray with the understanding also ; I will sing with the spirit, I will sing with the understanding also.’—The Christian religion was designed, not as a temporary dispensation, but to last through every period of the world. It was of great importance, for its future acceptance and usefulness, that it should approve itself to the sound understanding; that it should appear to all, who will seriously examine, to be indeed the *wisdom* of God unto salvation ; that it should be obvious to all who ‘ desire to do the will of God,’ not only that *grace*, but that *truth* also, came by Jesus Christ.

Some there are who value a doctrine in proportion to its obscurity : and those who make religion a matter of the imagination and of strong feeling, rather than of solid conviction and of steady though lively Christian affection and principle, might wish for more than ‘ the simplicity which is in Christ.’ But where the judgment is duly exercised, and the imagination properly placed under its regulation, the disciple of Jesus must rejoice when he sees the complete accordance of the truths of the Gospel with the dictates of the soundest understanding : and must feel grateful to the Father of Lights, that the bright display of Himself and His dispensations which the Gospel affords, is not obscured by the impenetrable cloud of incomprehensibility.—Is it possible that the clear understanding of important truth can make it less interesting or less valuable ?

Now if the Unitarian views of Christian truth are correct, there is nothing in the scheme of the Gospel which it is difficult to understand. Those principles which were most inconsistent with the prejudices of the Jews, and therefore to them most mysterious, are not so to us. On the contrary,—though they may excite our admiration, and our adoration of the unsearchable wisdom of Him who seeth the end from the beginning, and often chooseth means to execute His purposes which baffle human wisdom and presumption,—they contribute to bind the Gospel to the heart. That the blessings of the Gospel should be free to all, without distinction of Jew and Gentile,—free as the air we breathe,—and that they should be conveyed to us, not by the temporal prince and triumphant conqueror, but by the ‘Man of Sorrows,’ who through suffering and death became the Author of eternal salvation to all who obey him, present to our minds nothing mysterious, but, on the contrary, more clearly display to our eyes the wisdom of Him who is called the Only Wise God.

I do not say that Unitarianism entirely removes all difficulties from religion: I believe that difficulties will exist, as long as human excellence must include humility, trust, and resignation: and such is the admirable adaptation of Revelation to the wants of man, that these very difficulties are one cause of the attention which the mind pays to it, and which, where humbly and piously directed, is constantly rewarded by clearer and clearer perceptions of divine truth. But I do say, that Unitarianism removes the greatest and most oppressive difficulties which have tended to

prejudice the minds of thinking men against the Gospel. And though I would never relinquish a doctrine, proved by adequate evidence, merely because it is obscure, yet surely it is a presumption in favour of the divine origin of a doctrine, that it is clear and intelligible.—To many it may not be of any consequence whether they understand a thing or not. They may feel at perfect ease in receiving as true, from the authority of their parents and spiritual guides, that which they in no way profess to understand. But the more the mind is exercised, and the more knowledge on other subjects it acquires, the more it seeks to understand that which it is taught to believe; and the more extensively intellectual culture is diffused, the more generally will this want be experienced. In periods of spiritual darkness and spiritual slavery, the most absurd dogmas may be implicitly received; but where the light of knowledge beams on other subjects, and the rights of religious liberty and free inquiry are understood and exercised, the mind cannot rest in religious ignorance. And I do gratefully rejoice in the conviction, that, in the search after divine truth in the records and dictates of Revelation, the understanding may not only find its noblest field for exercise, but will be rewarded with knowledge which, while it is healthy to the soul, will prove invigorating to its own noblest powers.

But I will not enlarge on this point, further than by stating the positions which I had in view under this head,—viz. that the great principles of Unitarianism, (or, in other words, as I firmly believe, pure Christianity,) are easily understood: that they do not

perplex and confound the understanding : that they are adapted to the intellectual wants of all, and especially of those for whom the Gospel was peculiarly designed, the poor and unlearned :* that they relieve Christianity from those difficulties which erroneous views of it have caused, and which have led numbers to relinquish it : and that they make Christian faith, where it has been founded on evidence, more firm and steady, by freeing it from the sources of doubt, and wavering, and perplexity. Such, I hesitate not in believing, have been the effects of Unitarianism in numerous instances. And I trust, under the blessing

* It is confessedly difficult to remove from the minds of the unlearned, impressions derived from familiar and authoritative symbols of faith and formularies of worship : and to satisfy the inquisitive and learned, that passages which they have been habituated to interpret according to popular opinions, may, with justice, and perhaps even must, be explained according to opposing views, is often equally difficult. But the doctrines of Unitarianism are not difficult. Many of those who have embraced them from the serious search of the Scriptures, in opposition to early and long-continued prepossessions, have been known to say, that they have ‘come out of darkness into marvellous light.’ Nor is it difficult to derive them from the Scriptures, if these are read without note or comment, or pre-formed opinions. In such circumstances, the Scripturalist must be a Unitarian.—Those who wish to see how unlearned men, of sound understandings, and with a serious love of truth, may be led to Unitarianism almost without their perceiving it, and to reconcile with its doctrines the passages usually thought to oppose them, I refer, with great satisfaction, to a very valuable and interesting pamphlet, entitled “*An Account of the Rise and Progress of the Unitarian Doctrine, in the Societies at Rochdale, Newchurch in Rosendale, and other places, formerly in connexion with the late Rev. Joseph Cooke; in Ten Letters to a Friend. By John Ashworth. 1817.*”

of God, such will be its effect, increasing in a rapid proportion.

II. Intimately connected with the foregoing remarks, is the important fact, that **UNITARIAN CHRISTIANITY PRESENTS ONE OBJECT OF RELIGIOUS WORSHIP, ONE OBJECT OF THE HIGHEST AFFECTIONS OF THE HEART.**

The perplexities experienced by the thinking mind in connection with this essential point, have often been the cause of the examination, and subsequent rejection, of the popular doctrines.* If there are *Three Persons*, or *Intelligent Agents*, each infinite, each possessed of all the adorable perfections which belong to God,—if, in short, there are *Three separate distinct* Infinite Minds, of one substance, power, and glory, each subsisting separately, and capable of being made, separately, the object of thought, and of religious worship,—(however much the mind may,

* To what singular conclusions the mind is sometimes led, by clinging to long-imbibed notions respecting the Deity of Christ, and at the same time endeavouring to follow the clear principle of Revelation that GOD IS ONE, may be seen from the following Title of a book recently advertised in the London Papers: “ *A Seal upon the Lips of Unitarians and all those who refuse to acknowledge the SOLE, SUPREME, and EXCLUSIVE DIVINITY of our Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST.*” I presume the Author is a Swedenborgian. At least he must surely be a Sabellian.—Incomprehensible as is the *real* Trinitarian doctrine, it does not appear to me more incomprehensible than this doctrine, which must maintain that He who was sent was the same *Person* with Him who sent him; and that *he who PRAYED to the FATHER as the ONLY TRUE GOD, was himself the Only True God.*

by the aid of metaphysical subtleties, bring itself to believe that these Three Distinct Infinite Minds or Persons are **ONE GOD**, and that by holding the existence of such Three distinct Persons in the Godhead, the great principle of the Divine Unity is not violated,)—one thing is certain, that *EACH being separately God, must be the OBJECT of Religious Worship SEPARATELY from the others.*

In accordance with this plain and necessary conclusion, Prayers and other branches of Religious Worship are, in all Trinitarian Churches, (and by many Trinitarian individuals, agreeably to the practice and principles of their Churches,) offered up to **EACH of the Three Persons SEPARATELY.**

The consistent Trinitarian, *believing EACH PERSON to be TRULY GOD, and WORSHIPPING EACH SEPARATELY*, necessarily has Three Objects of Worship. By what principle shall he regulate his devotions to each? If he rest satisfied with partial examination, still his mind is likely to be bewildered: but if he look into the Christian's Directory, he there finds no precept directing the offering of Religious Worship to any other being but the Father; and, on the contrary, he finds numerous plain direct declarations in the Law, and the Prophets, and the Gospel, confirmed most powerfully by the uniform example and instruction of our Saviour, all pointing to this great truth, that *the FATHER is the ONLY PROPER OBJECT OF RELIGIOUS WORSHIP.* If so, the conclusion necessarily follows, that **HE is the ONLY TRUE GOD.**

Through the embarrassment and perplexity with which, to the reflecting mind, Trinitarianism is often

attended respecting the direction of Christian worship, many have been led to consider the evidence of popular opinions, and to relinquish them for those plain fundamental truths which shine with clear and strong effulgence throughout the whole of Revelation. And when they have embraced these, they have no longer any perplexity. Their devotions acquire a simplicity, which often adds to their fervency; and at least makes their devout affections steady and clear, and gives them the best prospect of shedding their influence over the whole tenor of life.

But, besides this consideration, there is another of great weight. Not merely are there, on popular doctrines, different objects of equal worship, but these have *different characters and offices assigned to them*. And it will generally be found, among those who hold the higher forms of what are called Evangelical doctrines, that he whom the Scriptures represent as the *effect* of God's love to mankind, is often thought of as the *cause*, the **PROCURING cause** of Divine Mercy; and thus that highest gratitude, which Reason and Revelation teach us is due to Jehovah, is diverted into a different channel. And can that commandment be then fulfilled, which our Saviour most solemnly sanctioned, when he said, 'The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is One, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength?'—See p. 95.

I have indeed no doubt, that many who profess and believe Trinitarian sentiments, influenced by the

plain principles, examples, and commands of the Gospel and of the Law, do, in practice, confine their worship, and the highest adoration of their hearts, to the Father, and love Jehovah as the Supreme Object of their best affections: but then they are so far (that is, practically) Unitarians; and we can only wish that they were so in avowed profession.

On this point Unitarianism is unrivalled. While it affords abundant grounds of love to him who bore in his character so eminent a resemblance to the moral excellencies of the Supreme Being, and who was, under Him, the agent of communicating the richest gifts of Divine Mercy; while it warms the heart with gratitude to our Saviour, for his exertions and sufferings to ensure and extend the blessed privileges of the Gospel; while it makes him the object of our *faith* and *trust*, as possessor of divine authority, sanctioned by the most signal marks of divine approbation; while it demands our *reverence* for him as the Son of God, as exalted to be the Lord of the dead and the living, and, under the appointment of God, to raise the dead and judge the world; it keeps clear and close to the great fundamental principle, ‘Thou shalt worship Jehovah thy God, and to Him only shalt thou offer religious service:’ it teaches us, (as the Scriptures teach us, and because the Scriptures teach us,) that He is the Only True God, that we ought to pay Religious Worship to Him alone, and that He is LOVE, and His Love the Source of every blessing, temporal and spiritual;—that He therefore should be the object of the HIGHEST LOVE, and GRATITUDE, and TRUST, and REVERENCE, and OBEDIENCE.

III. It is a most important advantage of UNITARIANISM, that it THROWS NO IMPEDIMENT IN THE WAY OF THE GREAT PRACTICAL PRINCIPLES OF THE GOSPEL.

Though it ascribes no merit to works, and represents all rewards of faith and obedience as solely the gifts of divine grace, yet it lays, as the Gospel does, the utmost stress upon *good works*, i. e. *Christian conduct springing from Christian principles*, such as love to God and to mankind, love to Christ, the desire of imitating his example, and obeying his precepts, the prospects of his Gospel, the dictates of conscience enlightened by Christian duty, &c. From the necessity of a holy life and conversation to obtain the divine favour and final acceptance, Unitarianism presents nothing to draw off the mind: but, on the contrary, it lays the greatest, most steady, and most consistent stress upon this. It gives abundant hope to the broken and contrite heart; but it does not, through unhappy views of the work and merit of the Son of God, afford any room to delay the work of repentance, or to expect that strong and agonizing feelings, an appropriating faith in his merits, and inward assurance of pardon, will supply the place of a sober, righteous, and godly life.

Unitarian Christianity goes to the heart, and requires watchfulness and caution in the work of duty: it allows no value to actions which do not spring from such principles within as are conformable with the will of God: in short, it assigns its due place to *faith*, as a valuable practical conviction of the great truths of religion influencing the heart; but it does not lead away from attention to its influences, by making it

consist in some mysterious inwrought feeling, which may be totally unproductive of that religious obedience which we have the authority of our Saviour's precepts and his example to pronounce the sum and substance of religion.

It may not at once appear obvious, but to the reflecting mind I may safely leave the examination of the position, that strict practical adherence to the Divine Unity, and its direct consequences of the Exclusive Worship of the Father, and His Unpurchased Essential Mercy, will necessarily lead to the adoption of those sound and consistent views of religion, which the instructions of our Saviour communicate; and to the eradication of those fallacious and baneful notions, which lead men to hope for some shorter and easier way to heaven than what he has pointed out to us.

The present popular views of Christianity have a direct tendency to make religion greatly consist in frames and feelings; or at least to represent these as essential tests of the state of the soul. Now these very much depend upon the constitution of the individual, upon the state of his bodily system at the time, upon the strength of his imagination, and other causes utterly independent of Christian excellence. In proportion as this standard or test is adopted, the mind is led away from Scriptural tests; and there is a great and natural leaning in the human mind to rest upon the former, which are obvious and easily applied, to the entire or partial exclusion of the latter. I do not think that this was so much the case with the Orthodox Writers of past times (who seem to have had in

w Christian principle, more than the peculiarities (Christian belief); but if we are to judge by the publications, and discourses, and hymns of many belonging to what are termed the Evangelical classes present, I think there is reason to believe that the signs of Christian excellence, and grounds of the divine favour, are more now than formerly, a mysterious, inexplicable feeling, which they term faith, the fervid emotions which are produced by the moral sympathy of the mind, and by excitements which may have a religious character, but which, far at least as the individual is concerned, have nothing to do with religion.

Religion," as is excellently stated by one who knows its real power, but whose strong sensibilities and glowing ardour of expression may sometimes have contributed to propagate the very error of which I am speaking,—“Religion, in its most general view, is such a sense of God upon the soul, and such a conviction of our obligations to him, and of our dependence upon him, as shall engage us to make it our great care to conduct ourselves in a manner which we have reason to believe will be pleasing to him.”* In such an account of it, we recognize the genuine spirit of the Christian: to hinder this principle, in Unitarianism there is nothing; to excite it to action and give it influence, is every thing.

Unitarianism leads us to expect nothing from God

WODDRIDGE'S *Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul*, p. 2, 2d Edition, 8vo.

without ourselves endeavouring to do his will. It places religion in the careful regulation of the heart and life by the spirit and precepts of Christ. It teaches us, most plainly and forcibly, that in the last great day ‘every one shall bear his own burden;’ that we must be rewarded or punished ‘according as our works have been;’ and that our situation in a future state of retribution will be exactly proportioned to the character and conduct of the individual, appreciated with the most unerring precision, by him who will judge the world in righteousness, under the guidance of the wisdom of Him who is all-wise. It encourages us to expect all needful aid and direction in the way of duty, in working out our salvation, in attaining the sanctification of the heart; but it presents no encouragement unless we do strive, and watch, and pray. It leads us to attend to the *formation of habits*, because it encourages no presumptuous hopes of miraculous interference to make the Ethiopian change his skin, or the Leopard his spots. It leads us too, *to begin early*; and I cannot doubt, that *the infinite importance of early attention to the religious and moral regulation of the character, is among none so strongly urged by their principles, as among the Unitarians.*

In fine, the Unitarian views of Christian duty, and the way in which its requirements are to be discharged, and of the terms of salvation,—though not so encouraging to indolence, to spiritual pride, and to sinful presumption, as I believe those presented by popular doctrines are in their natural tendency and frequent effects,—are *safe and secure*: they fully

accord with the representations of him who left us an example that we should follow in his steps ; and who made it his highest aim, and regarded it as his highest honour, to do the will of the Father who sent him, and to finish his work.

IV. UNITARIANISM THROWS NO IMPEDIMENT IN THE WAY OF CHRISTIAN LIBERALITY AND AFFECTION.

I do not see how it is possible to hold the doctrines of Unitarianism, and yet maintain that the favour of God and eternal salvation are confined to the narrow limits of sect and party. True it is, we are taught (Acts iv. 12) that there is ‘no other name under heaven *given* among men, by which we must be saved,’—that God has seen fit to propose no other terms of salvation to mankind, than those of the Gospel, and to appoint no other Mediator to convey the blessings of the New Covenant; and therefore that no one can possess those inestimable blessings *on the secure ground of* DIVINE PROMISE, but through faith in Christ. But the Unitarian rejoices in the conviction that, in every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness will be accepted by him (Acts x. 35); and that He who hath appointed to men the bounds of their habitation, and given them their various talents, will accept them according to what they have, and not according to what they have not.—If the untaught Heathen, or the deluded Mahomedan, to whom the light of the Gospel has never been offered,—or even the prejudiced Jew, or the misguided Deist, who, through errors of the understanding and not those of the heart, do not receive that light, though they live

surrounded by its rays,—if these, according to the light they do possess, faithfully obey the dictates of conscience, serving and loving the Deity as known to them, I cannot doubt that He, who is the Common Parent of all, will grant them *here* increasing light in the way of duty, and some portion of those present rewards which He has graciously connected with well-doing; and that in the future world He will make them partakers of blessings of which millions of them have never heard, and unite them under him who must reign till all enemies are put under his feet.

Too highly prizing the inestimable privileges, the sanctifying principles, the gracious hopes, the strengthening healing consolations of the Gospel, to feel otherwise than an earnest desire that they may be diffused to all who share the gift of reason,—feeling it his duty, (the debt of gratitude which he owes to the Author of all good, and to the Friend and Benefactor who shed his blood to communicate, assure, and extend, the blessings which he himself possesses, and the debt of love which he owes to all his brethren of mankind,) to contribute his efforts to the arrival of that period, when the name of God shall be universally hallowed, and His will done on earth as it is done in heaven, when all shall know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent,—and rejoicing in all that is wisely done by others to promote the glory of God,—the Unitarian has more honourable notions of the God of Love, than to imagine that He will make hundreds and thousands of millions miserable for ever, solely because they do not receive him as their Saviour, whose name they have never

heard. And yet, if this be not so, then the doctrines of modern orthodoxy are not true. And if these be true, one would willingly close one's eyes to this gloomy heart-rending consequence, till a period when it might appear, that the devouring flames and the blasting lightnings of divine wrath, even when they involve in never-ending misery innumerable creatures of his power, are only the bright beamings of his glory.

It has often appeared to me, that if Unitarianism did no more than annihilate the dreadful tenet, that all must be plunged into eternal and irremediable anguish, who do not possess faith in Christ, and even particular forms of that faith, it would have been worthy of all acceptance.

But the worst influences of this tenet on the Christian character, are seen in the more limited relations and connexions of life. It is the parent of uncharitableness, and the foster-mother of persecution. To view ourselves as the exclusive objects of the divine favour, and all who do not entertain our views of Christian faith as the objects of God's wrath and indignation, is not only injurious to His character, but has the direct tendency to generate spiritual pride, and to check the best affections of the heart towards those who differ from us. To account those our enemies who are, as we think, the enemies of God, is no part of *Christianity*; and those doctrines which lead to this estimation, lose the grand characteristic of the Gospel, while they destroy its delightful features as proceeding from the Father and Lord of all.

I rejoice in the belief, that multitudes of those who now, through the influence of human creeds, consign

the Unitarian to eternal perdition, will hereafter stretch to him the right hand of Christian friendship, if he have the happiness to join them where, not for their *unchristian errors*, but for their *Christian obedience*, I doubt not they will gain admission. But the unhappy notion which they have of exclusive salvation, makes them here look upon him with unkind suspicion as to his motives and his conduct, prevents them from listening to his reasons, and induces them to place a barrier (too often insuperable) against the admission of the simple truths of the Gospel, by those who are under their influence,

An eminent Christian Philosopher, lately deceased, (who, in his life and when going down the dark valley of death, showed the genuine influence and value of his Unitarian principles,) informs us, that when a most excellent and dutiful son, from conscientious motives, in opposition to his interests, renounced the religious system in which he had been educated, for another which he deemed more consonant to truth, his pious mother told him, that she found it to be her duty, however severe the struggle, to alienate her affections from him, now that he had rendered himself an enemy to God by embracing such erroneous sentiments; and she succeeded in this sacrifice of nature's feelings, and scrupulously performed what she believed her duty, to the end of her days. Would not the heart of this good woman have been almost overwhelmed with delight, if she could have seen that we become enemies to God only by wicked works; and that, at the last great day, the inquiry will not be, *What have you believed?* but, *Have you improved your*

talents? have you lived a sober, righteous, and godly life? have you done justice, loved mercy, and walked humbly with your God? have you lived as in his sight, followed the example of your Lord, and kept yourself unspotted from the world?*

* The fact above stated is given by the late Dr. COGAN, in his *Philosophical Treatise on the Passions* (p. 348). This excellent man was the Author of the well-known and very able tract, entitled *Letters to William Wilberforce, Esq. M. P. on the Doctrine of Hereditary Depravity: By a Layman*. His religious sentiments are more fully developed in his “*Theological Disquisition on the Characteristic Excellencies of Christianity; or, an Inquiry into the superior Assistance it affords, and Motives it contains for the Practice of Virtue, Cultivation of the Best Affections of the Heart, and preparing the Moral Offspring of God for permanent Felicity.*” I shall have occasion to advert to his views respecting the Mediation of Christ, in my Second Part: and I will here only recommend his work to those who, like himself, unite a cordial love of truth, and independence of understanding in the search after it, with a catholic spirit towards those who come to opposite conclusions with themselves.—There is an interesting Memoir of Dr. Cogan in the *Monthly Repository* for January and February last (1819), from which I extract the following statement, as it may communicate some salutary impressions to the open-minded opponent of Unitarianism.

“His conviction of the importance of divine truth grew with his attention to the subject. He laid it down as a maxim, that ‘Religion is every thing; or it is nothing; it is the one thing needful, or a phantom of the brain.’

“Among his papers there was found a Preface to a revised edition of his *Treatise on the Christian Dispensation*, of which this is the concluding paragraph:

“‘Before this edition will see the light, it is probable that the eyes of the author will be closed in darkness. Should this be the case, the following declaration may excite some attention to it. Its principles have afforded him much consolation during a large

The Unitarian sees that error on religious subjects must be injurious: that if its influence is prevented in the hearts of some, it will be injurious, directly or indirectly, to others: He is satisfied that truth connected with the character and dealings of God must do good; and that it is his duty to do what in him lies to diffuse it. He believes that he is thereby offering an acceptable service to the God of truth; imitating the example of him who came to bear witness to the truth; and contributing to glorify God in all things by Christ Jesus. But God forbid that he should ever suppose that piety and other Christian graces are confined to any religious denomination; or imagine himself better than another, because his views of Christian truth are more pure.

Unitarianism does a vast service to the cause of Christian charity, by levelling those narrow fences within which modern Orthodoxy confines all that is truly good and excellent. It thus disposes us to give

portion of life; they have rendered advanced years placid and serene, and enabled him to contemplate death itself, notwithstanding its gloomy appearance, as one of the most essential blessings in the whole plan of Providence.

“ ‘Fellow-Christians of every denomination, fare ye well! May we all meet round the throne of our reconciled Father, with filial joy and mutual congratulation!!’ ”—*Monthly Repository*, Feb. 1819, p. 76.

In the same number of the Repository, is the Memoir of *Mr. Benjamin Goodier*, whose early removal from scenes of usefulness did not prevent the fine display of the genuine influence of Unitarian sentiments in forming the Christian character, and in supporting under trials of faith and patience, and in the prospect of death.

the right hand of fellowship to all whose dispositions and conduct show that they have sat at the feet of Jesus. It destroys all those narrowing views which so often interfere with the great objects of benevolence; and it disposes to co-operate with all who have them in view, and to think well of them, when they separate from us and we from them, to promote respectively our more limited opinions.

By the man who has drunk deeply in the spirit of that Saviour who loved all mankind without distinction of name or country,—who has imbibed the principles of that religion which teaches us that love is the fulfilling of the law (of social duty), that without charity we are but as sounding brass or tinkling cymbals, and that the end of the commandments is charity out of a pure heart and faith unfeigned,—must it not be deemed a recommendation of any set of doctrines, and a presumption in favour of their being Christianity itself, that they promote these its grand essential qualities, and clear the way for their full exercise?

V. UNITARIANISM SHINES FORTH RESPLENDENTLY, IN RESPECT TO THE *CHARACTER AND DISPENSATIONS* OF THE GREAT FATHER OF ALL.

The light of the Gospel hath not entirely dispelled the clouds and darkness which human weakness and imperfection throw around the ways of God; and Unitarianism cannot do more; but much that Unitarianism opposes, involves them in greater darkness, or, should I not say, in gloom? Gloomy indeed are those representations of the Righteous Judge of the whole earth, which present him to us, as every revolving

year allowing tens of millions of those to whom His spirit hath given understanding, to go out of life, and fall into eternal misery, for want of that knowledge which His word could at once afford them, or of that grace which He who hath access to the heart could at once communicate. Terrific indeed are those doctrines, which teach us that His wrath could not be expiated, till its full vials had been emptied on the head of the merciful Redeemer of men ; or, that His justice could not be satisfied, till an innocent person had been punished in the place of the guilty. He who can dare to hope that, among the millions and millions who for ever and for ever must view their Creator only as the avenging Lawgiver and Judge, he stands secure from his awful indignation, may sing the hymn of gratitude for himself ; but will not human weakness shrink back with horror at the prospect, that a time will come, when the ties which here bound him to all mankind, as the children of one common Father,—the ties which bound him to those whom he saw doing good to men, and, as far as he could judge, obeying God, (ties which to feel was honourable,)—the ties which bound him with closer affections to friend or relative, and even those which are formed by the nearest domestic relations,—shall all be severed for ever, even where the only crime was unavoidable ignorance, or even where the friend or relative, the husband or the son, had in view, in the general tenor of his conduct, to live as in the sight of God, and with respect to the last great account? Will the expectation of individual happiness make the groans unheard, of misery unutterable, without alleviation, irremediable, and endless?

If this be Orthodoxy, no wonder that he who sees written in the law of Moses, ‘ the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious,’—who sees in the Prophets that Jehovah desireth not the death of the sinner,—who hears the Apostles speaking of the kindness and grace of God,—who hears his venerated Lord declare that **HE** is kind even to the unthankful and the evil,—who reads in the book of nature that the Lord is good unto all and his tender mercies are over all his works,—and who sees inscribed in unfading characters in the everlasting Gospel that ‘ **GOD IS LOVE** ’—pronounces that it is not Christianity.

I once asked a Unitarian friend, who while among the Wesleyan Methodists had manifested the spirit of devotion, if she found her piety impeded, or its fervour lessened, by her change of sentiments? Oh no! she replied; and she went on, with simple serious feeling, to tell me with what unmingled delight and unembarrassed love, she now contemplated the perfections and dealings of her Heavenly Father, how much more she now possessed to feed the purest flame of devotion. And it must be so. Certainly the doctrines of Unitarianism bring home the terrors of the Lord. They show that the holiness of God cannot look upon sin but with abhorrence: they show that His faithfulness and justice are concerned to punish the impenitent and disobedient: they teach us that His judgments will be administered with impartial equity; that every one shall reap as he now sows; and that rewards or punishments shall be awarded according as our works have been: they impress the soul, therefore, with reverential awe of that Great

Being, who is Almighty, All-wise, All-holy, All-just, our Omniscient Witness, and our Final Judge : they will not allow of irreverence or familiarity towards the Infinite and Adorable Majesty of heaven and earth.* But, at the same time, they present every every thing to enable us to offer to Him the best affections of the heart. They teach us, in an especial manner, to view God as our Father ; and in this, the most delightful and comprehensive appellation, (that in which our Saviour so continually represents the Great Being who sent him, and under which he teaches us to call upon Him,) they include every

* With many charges we have long been familiar ; and our astonishment is, not that they should keep aloof from us those who will not think for themselves, but that they should be made, and repeated, and even exaggerated, by those who have opportunities of knowing how unfounded they really are. One has recently been made against us, for which I was utterly unprepared. A ' Master in Israel ' has declared, as a " RADICAL ERROR " which diffuses " its influence *through every distinguishing part of* " *the UNITARIAN system,*"—" *the assumption of LOW AND DEGRADING THOUGHTS CONCERNING THE BLESSED AND HOLY GOD, His moral government, and the revelation of His justice and grace.*" (Dr. J. Pye Smith's *Scripture Testimony*, vol. i. p. 25.) On this point, at least, I always thought we stood unrivalled.—The charge is a serious one, and of all which have been urged, by men of intelligence and learning, against the doctrines of Unitarianism, this is the most destitute even of *apparent* foundation. I hope to find an opportunity of *showing* how groundless it is : at present I shall merely add, that it proceeds from one whose own native candour and sound judgment would have taught him better, if the prejudices of system, and the bigotry of others, incapable of appreciating his ingenuous liberality and love of truth, had not obstructed their influence.

g that can encourage, that can animate, that can
 sole, that can prompt to submission, to reverence,
 ve, to gratitude, to trust, to the best tribute of
 er and praise, of adoration, resignation, and obe-
 ce : and by this endearing representation, they
 us, as the Scriptures do, from which they are
 ved, the pledge of parental love, of parental
 , of parental guidance, of parental chastisements
 ed, but also of parental mercy.

well know that every Christian uses the appel-
 on FATHER, and that he considers the Supreme
 ig as standing in this relation : but I ask, is it not
 tter variance with those doctrines which make
infinite satisfaction of the Son of God the sole
 ind on which the sinner can rest his hopes ; which
 esent the death of Christ as *appeasing the wrath*
 od ; which talk of God *standing upon full satis-*
on and not remitting one sin without it, of the
d of Christ calming the Father's frowning face, of
*s forcing Him to spare, &c. ?** To my mind it is
 , that if the discourses of Jesus and his Apostles
 : divine authority, those doctrines have not ; and
 he who, though in words adopting the latter, keeps
 e in thought and feeling to the former, is in reality

Bishop Magee has declared (vol. i. p. 22), that “the sacrifice
 Christ was never deemed by any who did not wish to calum-
 te the doctrine of Atonement, to have *made* God placable.”
 statements in the text will hereafter be shown to be fully
 ed by those of Orthodox Divines : in the mean time I refer
 ishop, and those who rely upon him, to the *Appendix* of
 ladge's Sermon already referred to (p. 9) ; or to Mr. Wright's
Grace of God.

Being, who is Almighty, All-wise, All-holy, All-just, our Omniscient Witness, and our Final Judge : they will not allow of irreverence or familiarity towards the Infinite and Adorable Majesty of heaven and earth.* But, at the same time, they present every every thing to enable us to offer to Him the best affections of the heart. They teach us, in an especial manner, to view God as our Father ; and in this, the most delightful and comprehensive appellation, (that in which our Saviour so continually represents the Great Being who sent him, and under which he teaches us to call upon Him,) they include every

* With many charges we have long been familiar ; and our astonishment is, not that they should keep aloof from us those who will not think for themselves, but that they should be made, and repeated, and even exaggerated, by those who have opportunities of knowing how unfounded they really are. One has recently been made against us, for which I was utterly unprepared. A ' Master in Israel ' has declared, as a " RADICAL ERROR " which diffuses " its influence *through every distinguishing part of* " *the UNITARIAN system,*"—" *the assumption of LOW AND DEGRADING THOUGHTS CONCERNING THE BLESSED AND HOLY GOD, His moral government, and the revelation of His justice and grace.*" (Dr. J. Pye Smith's *Scripture Testimony*, vol. i. p. 25.) On this point, at least, I always thought we stood unrivalled.—The charge is a serious one, and of all which have been urged, by men of intelligence and learning, against the doctrines of Unitarianism, this is the most destitute even of *apparent* foundation. I hope to find an opportunity of *showing* how groundless it is : at present I shall merely add, that it proceeds from one whose own native candour and sound judgment would have taught him better, if the prejudices of system, and the bigotry of others, incapable of appreciating his ingenuous liberality and love of truth, had not obstructed their influence.

for us all, we may rest assured of His readiness to give every thing truly needful to his servants and children. By thus representing the Lord of Heaven and Earth, the Unitarian doctrine, following its great Teacher, displays a throne of grace with a merciful though righteous Sovereign seated on it, and that Sovereign our Father.

I am sure that piety is confined to no sect or party. Wherever there is gratitude, and trust, and resignation, and love, and the principle of obedience towards God even the Father, there is piety. I rejoice to catch something of their spirit who have imbibed the spirit of Christ, (which was piety in its purest form,) whether or not their doctrinal views agree with mine. In the ardour which animates them for the glory of God, and the cause of our common Lord, I desire to partake. Gladly should I possess the talent and the opportunity to try the genuine effect of the simple principles of the Gospel, where they think that good is done by what I deem of human invention. And in their work and service for the spiritual welfare of our fellow-creatures, I desire to judge of them, as I wish them to judge of me in mine. But confidently regarding the great principles of Unitarianism as the truth as it is in Jesus,—as the same that were known, though in a more limited degree, by those who in the Old Testament show us the genuine spirit of piety and devotion,—as the same that we witness in the New Testament, producing the noblest indications of piety in our Lord and his Apostles, animating them in the great work of duty and pious benevolence,—I cannot for a moment admit, that Unitarianism

a Unitarian at heart, even if he never in
appellation.

Now Unitarianism presents no Chr
with these heart-inspiring repre witness
ternal character of God. It exercises,
our Heavenly Father will, influence, of
family, support his author supporting in
penitent offender: it teaches contrition, and
state he will exercise in the love of
guilt and misery will pain, and giving solid
teaches that in joyful hope in the b
when he sees his a solemn protest against
their work, and ons of the ignorant or the bi
full repentance to be my full conviction, that
ment; but its genuine influence, promotes
to himself spirit of piety; and that if a man, pro
consequently, is destitute of the spirit of piety
him with, no more a Unitarian than he is a Ch
sure

part With these convictions, increasing as I e
to subject and consider the principles, spir
eration of the Gospel, I cannot but ident
cause of Unitarianism with that of the Gospe
I rejoice in the belief that the Bible-Ch
whatever unhappy notions he may have i
from human sources, so far as he keeps close
great fundamental truths of the Gospel, and
his practice and moulds his spirit by it, is pro
by his life and by his instructions, the cause v
deem Christian Truth. Motives may be ad
the simplicity that is in Christ, which for a tin
operate to draw away from its genuine influenc

for us all, we may rest assured of His readiness to give every thing truly needful to his servants and children. By thus representing the Lord of Heaven and Earth, the Unitarian doctrine, following its great Teacher, displays a throne of grace with a merciful though righteous Sovereign seated on it, and that Sovereign our Father.

I am sure that piety is confined to no sect or party. Wherever there is gratitude, and trust, and resignation, and love, and the principle of obedience towards God even the Father, there is piety. I rejoice to catch something of their spirit who have imbibed the spirit of Christ, (which was piety in its purest form,) whether or not their doctrinal views agree with mine. In the ardour which animates them for the glory of God, and the cause of our common Lord, I desire to partake. Gladly should I possess the talent and the opportunity to try the genuine effect of the simple principles of the Gospel, where they think that good is done by what I deem of human invention. And in their work and service for the spiritual welfare of our fellow-creatures, I desire to judge of them, as I wish them to judge of me in mine. But confidently regarding the great principles of Unitarianism as the truth as it is in Jesus,—as the same that were known, though in a more limited degree, by those who in the Old Testament show us the genuine spirit of piety and devotion,—as the same that we witness in the New Testament, producing the noblest indications of piety in our Lord and his Apostles, animating them in the great work of duty and pious benevolence,—I cannot for a moment admit, that Unitarianism

rianism is deficient, unless the Gospel is, in the sources of piety : and owing to Unitarianism, and to that alone, whatever I have of piety and Christian feeling, and having known and often witnessed its influence in leading to the highest exercises, and, still more, to the most habitual influence, of piety, strengthening in the hour of trial, supporting in affliction, raising in humiliation and contrition, animating in the work of duty, keeping in the love of God, smoothing the pillow of pain, and giving solid peace, and tranquil nay even joyful hope in the hour of death,—I here enter a solemn protest against the misrepresentations of the ignorant or the bigotted, and declare it to be my full conviction, that Unitarianism, in its genuine influence, promotes and includes the spirit of piety ; and that if a man, professing its principles, is destitute of the spirit of piety, he is, in reality, no more a Unitarian than he is a Christian.

With these convictions, increasing as I examine the subject and consider the principles, spirit, and operation of the Gospel, I cannot but identify the cause of Unitarianism with that of the Gospel itself. I rejoice in the belief that the Bible-Christian, whatever unhappy notions he may have imbibed from human sources, so far as he keeps close to the great fundamental truths of the Gospel, and shapes his practice and moulds his spirit by it, is promoting, by his life and by his instructions, the cause which I deem Christian Truth. Motives may be added to the simplicity that is in Christ, which for a time may operate to draw away from its genuine influence ; but

he who leads men to sit at the feet of Jesus, and to learn of him the words of everlasting life, will make them wise unto salvation: and if they do not see the resplendent truths of the Essential Mercy, and Unrivalled Supremacy of the One God, while here upon earth, they will be prepared to see them where there will be no clouds of ignorance or imperfection. I do certainly believe, that the means which are taken to disseminate the knowledge of the great salvation, often are, and from their nature must be, ineffectual; because they are anticipating the order of Providence, and have in view to make Christians those who first must be made Men. I do also certainly believe, that Christianity will not extensively spread among Heathens, Mahometans, and Jews, till those who profess it have learnt to confine their creeds to the Bible, in other words, till, in all essential points, they become Unitarians: the world will not be Christianized, till Christians in general are Unitarianized. But wherever, and by whomsoever, scriptural views of God, His moral government, His character, and the terms of salvation, are disseminated, in other words, by whomsoever Christianity is taught scripturally and practically,—from my soul I bid them God-speed, and pray for the divine blessing upon them.

As I believe that Unitarianism is pure Christianity, and I am sure that Jesus will reign till all ‘people, nations, and languages, shall serve him,’ I look forward with cheering conviction to the universal prevalence of Unitarianism: and when I turn to the

language of divine prophecy, I see the same expressly taught in the sacred pages, where they declare, ‘And Jehovah shall be King over all the earth ; in that day shall there be one Jehovah,’ *in that day* JEHOVAH *shall be* ONE, ‘and His NAME ONE,’ (*Zech. xiv. 9.*) According to my full conviction, this passage cannot have its complete accomplishment, till the Proper Unity of God is universally acknowledged ; till all the followers of that Master who prayed to the FATHER as the ONLY TRUE GOD, shall pay undivided and unrivalled honours to JEHOVAH, his Father and our Father, his God and our God.—*John xvii. 3 ; xx. 17.*

That time is not yet. When the pious disciple of Jesus looks round and perceives the greatest part of the world still ignorant of the Gospel, and sees it, where it is received, so little employed to regulate the heart and the life, he is prone to be impatient, and for a moment perhaps to doubt the promise of his coming. And just so the Unitarian, dispirited by opposition, by obloquy, and by misrepresentation, is apt to let disappointed feelings overcome him, and check him in the diffusion of Christian light. But God’s time is best. What we have to do, is, to work in our respective spheres to promote the cause of Christian truth and duty. If we can do no more, it may cheer us to remember that “they also serve who only stand and wait.” We know that the great work is to be accomplished, and by human means ; and we should ever have our eyes open to observe what opportunities our Heavenly Father, in his providence, affords us to work with him.

Far be it from me to wish, that the Unitarian

should be always endeavouring to extend his doctrines controversially. Great good is done, if the plain impressive practical principles of the Gospel, the simple truths of the Scriptures, are communicated *influentially*, without the doctrines which tend, as far as they operate, to impede their influence. And above all it should be remembered, that Unitarianism will not spread through the Christian world, till Unitarians take care that their light so shine before men, that others, seeing their good works, may be led to glorify their Father who is in heaven. A Unitarian professor leading an ungodly life, and in proportion as he does so,—in proportion as he forsakes the spirit, and example, and precepts of his Lord,—does more to check the progress of truth, than his most zealous and public profession of it can do good.

And here, among other things, I draw encouragement respecting the spread of Unitarianism. Its great doctrines are now among numbers confessed practically. Unitarians are becoming, in their views, and I trust in their practical principles, more and more evangelical, in the best sense of the term. It will promote this most desirable result, that they have, in various instances, and in a painful degree, been made the objects of reproach, of bitter attempts to injure them in their interests, their reputation, their usefulness, and their peace, because they embrace what the world calls heresy. It will make them more watchful and circumspect, that they give not occasion to the enemies of truth to speak evil of it on their account. When Unitarians show in their lives the pure and active influence of the truths they profess, and live

not according to the corrupt maxims and example of the world, their cause *will* go on and prosper.

And notwithstanding the impediments it has from within and from without, it is prospering. Like the cause with which I cannot but identify it, it does, it will, experience fluctuation ; and those who see the waves retiring in one place, may not be aware how much they are moving onward in another. In various instances of frequent and extensive occurrence, the Unitarian controversy has gradually lowered the tone of Orthodoxy, till it has nothing left but the name. Lately the fact has been brought before the public, which has long been known to individuals, that in the very cradle of Calvinism, what many here call the essential doctrines of the Gospel are virtually abandoned. And though I do anticipate that the absurd efforts which are made there to prevent free inquiry, and which show the danger of arming the professors of religion, however pure, with temporal authority, will defeat their object, and give opposing principles a power which they would not otherwise possess ; yet I cannot see any reason to apprehend that their power will extend further than to make *that* genuine Unitarianism which unhappily is yet mixed with something of the old leaven. I might also go to the Western Continent, and could state that the same process is taking place among multitudes who are perhaps scarcely aware of the full extent to which they have left the doctrines of Orthodoxy, but who preach and hear the Gospel, and worship the God of our Lord Jesus Christ on Unitarian principles. And those of us who have observed the inquiries of

Rammohun Roy of Calcutta, and the humbler but highly valued efforts of William Roberts, near Madras, cheer ourselves with the conviction that the day-star of Unitarianism has arisen also in the East. But what, for the present, I feel the most encouraging circumstance of all, is, that in various parts of our own land, many thinking intelligent men, of Christian principles and genuine piety, among that class who are least likely to be influenced by worldly motives, have been gradually embracing and then openly avowing Unitarian principles, led to them by the simple study of the Scriptures, and often without knowing that there were any in the world who held the same views of Christian truth with themselves.—See p. 350.

When such men as these go back again, then may the Unitarian advocate be staggered; but when he sees persons of all ranks, and especially among those whose circumstances have most led them to the close study of the Scriptures, leaving the principles of childhood, after cautious serious investigation, and often, in consequence of their avowal of obnoxious truth, subjected to many worldly privations and great discouragements, and yet rejoicing in the light they possess, desirous to impart it to others, and, above all, solicitous to display its influence in their lives, he feels that he is not labouring alone: and while aiming to promote the glory of God, and the great ends for which his Saviour came forth from the Father, and for which he shed his blood, he knows that God's truth must be omnipotent; he knows that he must add to it no human admixture; he knows that, to promote

it, he must employ no unholy weapons; and he goes on in the work of reformation, with humble hope that he has his Lord's approbation, while in his name he endeavours to diffuse that knowledge which is the way to eternal life, while in his name he teaches men to know the Only True God and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent,—while in his name he contributes to the arrival of the period when the kingdom of Christ, the kingdom of God, shall extend over the whole earth,—when JEHOVAH SHALL BE ONE, AND HIS NAME ONE,—when every where THE NAME OF GOD SHALL BE HALLOWED, AND HIS WILL DONE ON EARTH, AS IT IS DONE IN HEAVEN.

‘EVEN SO: COME, LORD JESUS.’

A P P E N D I X.

APPENDIX A.

Specification of the Unnoticed Departures of the IMPROVED VERSION, from the Text of NEWCOME'S REVISION.

THE very careful and minute collation, referred to in p. 309, extended, I perceive, even to the minutiae of *orthographical* and *slight grammatical* corrections: such as *murder* for *murther*, *no one* for *none*, *of Jesus* for *Jesus's*, *told* for *have told*. With the exception of these, (which of course it would answer no purpose for me to specify, and which must appear to every one could seldom be worth noticing,) there is every reason to believe that the following are ALL the departures from Newcome, which have not been (at least sufficiently) noticed in the Improved Version.

In what follows,

N. R. denotes the rendering in the *Text* of Newcome's Revision.

N. m., his *marginal* rendering.

* is prefixed, where it is indicated in the Improved Version that an alteration is made, but it is left uncertain what is the rendering of Newcome's text.

† is prefixed where a similar alteration is once or more noticed in the context.

MATT. vi. 7. I. V. * Use not many IDLE words—N. R. many words. *Newcome's Note.* " ' Use not many idle words,' may perhaps express the idea more exactly. "

—— x. 23. I. V. finished—N. R. gone through—N. m. " Or, finished. "

—— 24. I. V. A disciple—A servant—N. R. THE disciple—THE servant.

—— xiii. 39, 40, 49. I. V. age—N. R. world—N. m. " Or, age. "

—— xviii. 3. I. V. * Unless ye BE CHANGED—N. R. TURN—N. m. " Or, be changed. "

—— 17. I. V. * congregation (*twice*)—N. R. church—N. m. " Or, congregation. "

—— xix. 17. I. V. Why askest thou me concerning good? One *only* is good.—*This is the rendering of Newcome's margin: in the text the Primate follows the Received Text and Public Version, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God.^a*

—— xxiii. 10. I. V. your leader [*even the Christ*]
N. R. your Leader, *even Christ.*^b

—— xxiv. 23. I. V. Lo, here is the Christ.—N. R. Lo, here is Christ.

—— xxvi. 4. I. V. and consulted HOW—N. R. THAT.

MARK i. 4. I. V. John, *accordingly*, baptized.—N. R. John baptized.

^a It is obvious that if the Editors had been capable of the disingenuousness, fraud, and falsehood, so continually attributed to them, they would *here* have *followed* Newcome and the Public Version.

^b In his Note, the Primate says that the words ὁ χριστος "have as strongly the appearance of a gloss as at verse 8." In the 4th Edition the I. V. properly omits the brackets; but puts the clause in *Italics*.

MARK x. 35. I. V. Teacher—N. R. Master—N. m. “Gr. Teacher.”^a

———— I. V. request—N. R. desire.

—— xv. 6. I. V. Now at *that* feast he was wont to release.—*This is the rendering of Newcome's Note. In the Text the Primate has, ‘he by custom released.’*

LUKE i. 32. I. V. shall be called Son of the Most High.—N. R. *the* Son.

—— 35. I. V. shall be called A Son of God.—N. R. *the* Son.

—— xix. 39. xx. 21, 28. xxi. 7. xxii. 11. As in Mark x. 35.

JOHN i. 12. I. V. he gave AUTHORITY TO BE the children of God.—N. R. POWER TO BECOME.

—— i. 15. I. V. places this verse after the 18th.—N. R. retains the usual order.

—— i. 17. I. V. favour and truth WERE—N. R. CAME.

—— i. 25. I. V. † THE prophet—N. R. A prophet. —

—— iii. 13. I. V. [who is in heaven.]—N. R. who WAS in heaven.

—— v. 35. I. V. He was THAT burning—N. R. A burning.

—— x. 29. I. V. † force—N. R. snatch.

—— xiii. 27. I. V. † the piece of bread—N. R. the sop.

—— xiv. 22. I. V. Judas (not Iscariot)—N. R. (not *Judas* Iscariot.)

—— xix. 11. I. V. † authority—N. R. power.

—— xx. 19. I. V. the doors where the disciples were assembled having been shut for fear of the Jews—N. R. the doors having been shut, for fear of the Jews, where the disciples were assembled.

ACTS viii. 32. I. V. as THE lamb is dumb—N. R. A lamb.

^a In such cases would not *Rabbi* be the best rendering of διδασκαλῆς?

ACTS xiv. 17. I. V. giving you rain—N. R. [us].

— xvi. 31. I. V. † safe—N. R. saved.

ROM. ix. 5. I. V. by natural descent—N. R. as concerning the flesh.

1 COR. iv. 9. I. V. last, as devoted to death—N. R. last *on the theatre* as devoted to death.

— ix. 20. I. V. to those—N. R. *even* to those.

2 COR. viii. 9. I. V. that WHILE he was rich, for your sakes he LIVED IN POVERTY.—N. R. that, THOUGH he was rich, for your sakes he BECAME POOR.

GAL. i. 10. I. V. a servant—N. R. *the* servant.

HEBR. viii. 6. I. V. whose pedigree—N. R. whose genealogy—N. m. “Or, pedigree.”

— xii. 25. I. V. For if those escaped not who refused HIM WHEN HE UTTERED oracles on earth, MUCH LESS *shall* WE escape, if we reject him SPEAKING FROM HEAVEN—N. R. HIM THAT UTTERED—MUCH MORE WE SHALL NOT ESCAPE—WHO *was* FROM HEAVEN.

1 JOHN i. 2. I. V. we have seen—N. R. we have seen it.

REV. xxi. 10. I. V. in spirit—N. R. in *the* spirit.

I have now only to request the Reader, after he has examined the foregoing Specification, to turn back to pp. 311, 312, where he will find Bishop Magee's assertions, and also my own. I cheerfully leave the case to any one possessing common discrimination and common candour.

APPENDIX B.

On Bishop MAGEE's Strictures respecting the Unitarian Interpretation of JOHN x. 18.

The original of the 17th and 18th verses of John x., is as follows :

Δια τουτο ὁ πατηρ με αγαπα, ὅτι εγω τιθημι την ψυχην μου, ινα παλιν λαβω αυτην. Ουδεις αἶρει αυτην απ' εμου, αλλ' εγω τιθημι αυτην απ' εμαυτου· εξουσιαν εχω θειναι αυτην, και εξουσιαν εχω παλιν λαβειν αυτην. Ταυτην εντολην ελαβον παρα του πατρος μου.

The Improved Version thus renders these verses :

“ For this my Father loveth me ; because I lay down my
 “ life, that I may take* it again. None taketh it from me ;
 “ but I lay it down of myself. *I have authority to lay it down,*
 “ *and I have authority to receive it again.* This commission
 “ I have received from my Father. ”

On the clause here put in Italics, the following Note is given in the Improved Version.

“ See Wakefield. To lay down life was a voluntary act, to
 “ which Jesus submitted in full confidence that it would be
 “ speedily restored to him. The common version, which the
 “ Primate here adopts, is, ‘ I have power to lay it down, and
 “ I have power to take it again’ ; which seems to imply that
 “ our Lord’s resurrection was the effect of his own power, a
 “ sense which the words in the original do not convey, and
 “ which is directly contrary to the most explicit declarations

* This word should, of course, have been altered, to correspond with what follows; ‘ that I may receive it again.’ The correction is made in the 4th Edition.

“ of the Scriptures. Acts ii. 24; iii. 15; Rom. vi. 4;
 “ 1 Cor. xv. 15.”*

Wakefield renders the clause thus : “ I have a commission
 “ to lay it down, and I have a commission to receive it again :”
 and that the Reader may have the whole case before him, I
 quote his Note on the passage.

“ V. 18. *a commission* : ἐξουσίαν : or *I am authorised* : though
 “ this is not so applicable to the *laying down* of his life as to
 “ the *receiving of it again* ; and the passage is of that kind
 “ adduced in my *Silva Critica*, on Matt. xxvi. 29. † In all the
 “ variety of places where ἐξουσία is used, it uniformly means
 “ *authority, or privilege, or a delegated commission, conferred*
 “ *by some superior.*”

* The copy of the I. V. lying before me, fell into the hands of
 a *Minister* among the Whitfieldites. It was borrowed by him from
 a poor Unitarian to whom it had been given. Before he returned
 it, he made many Notes in it ; of which the following are a fair
 sample.—In the *Introduction*, the Editors speak of the late excel-
 lent and upright Mr. KENRICK of Exeter, as the “ active, zealous,
 and persevering advocate of pure and uncorrupted Christianity.”
 On this the Note-writer says, “ I think this a lying title. For no
 “ Socinian under heaven knows what pure and uncorrupted
 “ Christianity is.”—On the Note on Matt. xxv. 46, the Minister
 declares, that “ at death, they [the Socinians] will find them-
 “ selves among the wicked, which shall live in endless torments.”
 —On Luke xi. 26, he observes, “ Such will be the state of Sceptics
 “ and Infidels, Deists, Arians, and Socinians.”—At the end of
 the above Note on John x. 18, the Minister puts this summary
 condemnation, “ *A base lie.*”—This is a specimen of the language
 frequently used against us, and even in the pulpit,—out of the
 Establishment at least. And thus it is, that the minds of the un-
 thinking are prejudiced against us and our arguments.

† I have no opportunity of referring to the *Sylva Critica* ; but
 I presume it gives cases similar to those above which I shall soon
 cite.

The Editors simply assert, that "the words in the original do not convey" that notion which the Public Version seems to imply, viz. that *Christ raised HIMSELF from the dead*: they do not say they CANNOT.—The passage is one of those which, in themselves considered, are too indefinite to decide a controverted question; and therefore, according to the simplest principles of interpretation, it must be explained by the known fact, or the general tenor of Scripture. If the resurrection of Christ had not been most strongly, repeatedly, and unambiguously referred to the immediate agency of God, this passage, in connexion with the much more forcible expression in John ii. 19,* might have led us to the opinion, that Christ possessed the power, in some inexplicable way, to raise himself from the dead. *As to the SOURCE of that power,*

* John ii. 19. 'Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.'—If this were the only passage in which the immediate Agent in the resurrection of Christ is spoken of, it might with some reason be inferred, that, in some incomprehensible manner, our Lord, by power derived from Him to whom he referred all his power, raised himself from the dead. But the New Testament so repeatedly, distinctly, and authoritatively declares that 'God raised up Jesus,' that the simplest principles of interpretation lead us to seek for a different solution; and it is easily found by attending to the peculiarities of prophetic language. The Prophet Jeremiah (ch. i. 10) declares that Jehovah said unto him, 'See, I have this day set thee over the nations, and over the kingdoms, *to root out, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant*'; clearly implying "that God had appointed Jeremiah to declare *His purposes* "concerning the overthrow or restoration of kingdoms and "nations." In like manner Isaiah (ch. vi. 10) is commanded to *make the heart of Israel fat*, i. e. to *foretell* their obduracy and incredulity. And what is still more express and to our purpose, Ezekiel (ch. xliii. 3) speaks of having been sent 'to destroy the city,' i. e. to prophesy its destruction.—From these examples, Prebendary Lowth, in his *Commentary on the Prophecies*, states it as a

we must still have looked to his own words. ‘*The FATHER who dwelleth in me* **HE DOTH THE WORKS.**’

The latitude of the original, cannot here be represented in a translation. The Public Version almost forces, upon the minds of the unlearned, an opinion which the *uninterpreted* original cannot force on the minds of the learned. The I. V. translates it so as to avoid that opinion; but it necessarily loses sight of the import which the original, *taken independently*, might convey. Both modes of rendering are justified by the original; but one only is accordant with the plain, repeated, and express declarations of Scripture, that ‘God raised up Jesus’: and this the Improved Version has adopted.*

general principle, “*That the Prophets are said to do things, when they DECLARE GOD’S PURPOSE OF DOING THEM.*”

In exact accordance with the phraseology of prophecy, as well with the express assertion of his Apostles, we may understand our Lord, (speaking as he obviously did with the obscurity of prophecy, yet in the common prophetic style,) as **DECLARING** *that it was GOD’S PURPOSE to raise him up.*—The Reader will judge whether this view of the subject is not more reasonable and satisfactory than that of Dr. Magee, which he will find in the next Note.

* Dr. Magee’s hypothesis, (designed to show the consistency of the usual interpretation of our Lord’s words in John ii. 19, and in chap. x. 17, 18, with the explicit unambiguous reference of our Lord’s resurrection to the immediate agency of God,) is as follows. “That the *Father* and the *Son*, both possessed (as the Scriptures inform us) of that infinite power which alone could raise the dead to life, *should BOTH be said to perform the act of reuniting the spirit of Christ to the body which he had assumed*, so as to cause the reanimating of that body and his resurrection from the grave, has nothing in it irreconcilable to reason, and has every thing in it reconcilable to Scripture, and fully satisfies the several declarations of the N. T. upon that subject.”—*Postscript*, p. 57 [521].

The rendering of the I. V. is not, however, altogether a happy one:—"authority to be a mere recipient," does not

The Bishop has not shown us where, in the Scriptures, the SON is said to have possessed INFINITE power; and as the Son himself declares that, INDEPENDENTLY of HIM by *whose power he performed his mighty works*, HE COULD DO NOTHING, I maintain, on his own authority, that, *in his own nature*, he had not infinite power. In what sense alone he can be said to have possessed such power, I have already stated in p. 69, *note*. If the intelligent Inquirer should think Dr. Magee's *hypothesis*, for it is nothing more, preferable to the simpler one adopted by the Unitarians, (that it was the Father alone, by his own immediate agency, who raised up Jesus,) yet, if he keep close to Scripture, he must also admit that the power by which the Son raised up his bodily habitation was GIVEN him by that Great Being who is called '*the Blessed and ONLY Potentate, who ALONE hath Immortality.*'

The hypothesis which the Bishop adopts, corresponds with the representation given in Stanhope's *Commentary on the Epistles and Gospels* (vol. i. p. 338) respecting the *agency of the SON HIMSELF in the Miraculous Conception*. 'The pious writer intimates, that this action, though attributed to the Holy Ghost in particular, was effected by the agency of all the three persons in the Trinity; for here (says he) "that *rule of the schools* takes place, that the entire union of the divine nature makes all such actions common to all three, as do not refer to the properties and relations by which they stand distinguished from each other. *Jesus* is therefore the *Son of God*, because conceived by the Spirit of the Father." (Though the author himself says, in the next page, "strictly and truly he is Son of God, by virtue of his Eternal Generation alone.") "And *the same Son of God*, who raised his own body from death, FORMED THAT SAME BODY in the virgin's womb."—While the Unitarian sees his Trinitarian brother involved in such metaphysical absurdities, he feels that he has indeed reason to rejoice that he has not so learned Christ.

If the Apostle John had understood our Lord's words as our orthodox brethren do, I think it almost certain that he would not

convey a satisfactory impression to the mind; and Bishop Magee indulges himself in a tone of indecent sarcasm

immediately have said, 'When therefore he was raised (ἡγέρθη) from the dead,' &c. But, to pass by what may admit of some doubt, I deem it quite certain that the Apostles of Christ would not, in their discourses, and their epistles, so unequivocally and exclusively and repeatedly refer the resurrection of Christ to the 'mighty power' of 'the God of our Lord Jesus Christ' (Eph. i. 17, 19), and never once intimate, what they must have known, if the fact, that Christ Jesus RAISED HIMSELF from the dead. For myself, I rest, with the fullest conviction, in the great truth that it was God, even the FATHER, who raised our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead. The Unitarian follower of Christ is quite satisfied to be found among those who (according to his Apostle's words) 'through him do believe in God that raised him up from the dead and gave him glory, that' our 'faith and hope might be in God.' 1 Pet. i. 21.

If the Reader wish to know the Scripture Doctrine on the subject, let him consult *Acts iv. 10; *x. 38—41; *xiii. 30, 37; Rom. iv. 24, 25; vi. 4; viii. 11; *x. 9; *1 Cor. xv. 15; Gal. i. 1; *Eph. i. 16—20; Col. ii. 12; 1 Thess. i. 9, 10; Hebr. xiii. 20; 1 Pet. i. 3, 20, 21; &c.; especially those to which an asterisk is prefixed. Throughout 1 Cor. xv. the passive verb, ἐγέρθη (has been raised) &c., is used in reference to the resurrection of Christ; and I know no reason why it should not be rendered passively.

I have stated my opinion above, (p. 385,) that no word could be employed in rendering John x. 17, 18, which would convey to the English reader the necessary ambiguity of the original: but a passage in one of our best hymns on the Resurrection of Christ, suggests the word *resume*, which might perhaps be advantageously used. 'I am authorized to lay it down; I have the privilege to resume it again.' The verse I refer to is as follows:

"With strength immortal forth he comes,
And power and life from God *resumes*;
The days of pain and sorrow past,
His triumph shall for ever last."

The Hymn is from the pen of one whose life and ministry show

respecting it, which, had it proceeded from a Unitarian, he would have styled *impious* and *blasphemous*. After closing his reasoning by talking about the "authority of the cask to receive the infused liquor," he pronounces the views of the Editors to be "arrant and inexplicable nonsense."

It would probably be best to translate *ἐξουσία* by a different word in each clause; e. g. 'I have authority to lay it down; and it is my privilege to receive it again.'* Every intelligent classical scholar well knows, that the same word must often be rendered, even in the same sentence, with different meanings, according to the connexion. Cæsar thus employs *legatus*,

that Unitarianism does not impede the noblest exercises of the devout affections; and whose *Sermons for Families*, &c., have contributed to cherish them, and the other principles of Christian duty, far beyond the sphere of his personal example and exertions: I refer to the Rev. *Edmund Butcher*, of Sidmouth. If the Bishop of Raphoe, or any other opponent of Unitarianism, would peruse that hymn, as well as various others in the little volume from which I quote it, (the *Exeter Collection of Psalms and Hymns for Social and Private Worship*,) he could scarcely fail to perceive, that Unitarians are not justly chargeable with entertaining low thoughts of the Lord Jesus Christ, or of the Salvation which God hath wrought through him.

* In ch. v. 27, the Public Version renders *ἐξουσία* by *authority*. The other instances in which the word occurs in St. John's Gospel, are ch. i. 12 (see p. 316—318); xvii. 2; xix. 10, 10, 11; and the passage before us. In his Epistles the word does not occur. In the Revelations it occurs frequently. In most cases it there signifies *authority* or *dominion*, commonly with the connected notion of its *being given*; but in one instance it is used where we should expect *δύναμις*, viz. Rev. ix. 19. It is commonly rendered *power* in the Public Version; but in ch. xxii. 14, it is rendered *right*,—'that they may have a right to the tree of life.'—It is rather singular that St. John does not employ *δύναμις* in his Gospel or Epistles.

in *Bell. Gall.* iv. 22: *Reliquum exercitum Q. Titurio Sabino et L. Aurunculeio Cottæ LEGATIS, in Menapios, atque in eos pagos Morinorum, ab quibus ad eum LEGATI non venerant, deducendum dedit.* In like manner *Sophocles* uses *αρχη*, *Œd. Tyr.* 383, 385.

Εἰ τιςδὲ γ' ἀρχῆς οὐνεχ', ἦν ἐμοὶ πόλις
Δωρητόν, οὐκ αἰτητόν, εἰσεχειρίσει,
Ταυτῆς Κρεων ὁ πιστός, οὐξ ἀρχῆς φίλος,—

But I need not multiply examples. The Royal Translators themselves have recognized the principle in this very passage: they render *λαμβάνω* *take and receive*, in this one verse.

Arguing against Mr. Wakefield's position, the Bishop brings forward several passages to prove that *ἐξουσία* has no necessary reference to *delegated* authority. Mr. Wakefield knew this perfectly well; and says nothing necessarily implying the contrary. The clause of his Note, "conferred by some superior," legitimately refers to the last expression, "a delegated commission;" and by the common principles of construction it does not refer to the two former. The Bishop has therefore taken some trouble to prove, what we readily admit, from our own acquaintance with the Scriptures, and have never denied. It is one of the numberless cases in which he blinds, probably his own eyes, and at any rate his Reader's, as to the true nature of the question.

In a similar manner he attempts to prove (p. 52) what his own cause did not require; and he fails in the proof. He thinks proper to maintain, that "*Trommius, Biel, and Schlœusner*" "directly contradict this dogmatical and most unfounded assertion of *Wakefield*, by assigning to the word, besides the species of power implied by the terms *authority, privilege, and delegated commission*, the sense of *power generally*, in its fullest and strongest import; and support this sense of the word by numerous examples."—Such is Dr. Magee's assertion; now for the fact.

Trommius, in his invaluable Concordance of the Septuagint, gives to *ἐξουσία* the force of *potestas*; and he adduces six texts in which it occurs as the representative of *הָרָצוֹן*, *domi-*

natio; one in Daniel, for *וְלָו*, *potestatem habens, dominator*; and seven, also from Daniel, where it is employed for *וְלָו* [*dominatus*]. Trommius also cites various passages from the Apocrypha, to which, of course, he assigns no specific meaning; but they obviously have the general signification of *authority or dominion*.—TROMMIUS, therefore, gives no authority to Dr. Magee to assert, that he assigns to *ἐξουσία* the sense of power generally, in its fullest and strongest import.

Nor does BIEL, who (after assigning to *δυναμις* the force of *potentia, robur, virtus, facultas, opes, divitiæ, vires, militia, exercitus*,) gives to *ἐξουσία* the appropriate significations of *potestas, dominium, imperium, dominatio*, and nothing corresponding to power in any sense not included in these.

Out of three of his authorities, the Bishop has asserted that two say what they do not say. Let us consider the third.

According to SCHLEUSNER, *δυναμις* means power (*potentia*), ability, efficacy, the faculties of the mind, and the powers of the body; as applied to God, it implies majesty and omnipotence; it also denotes (he says) the immediate effects of divine power, such as miracles; and, naturally enough, the power of working miracles. What, in his judgment, is the force of *ἐξουσία*?

First let us take Dr. Magee's summary representation of Schleusner, " ' 1. *Vis et potestas efficiendi aliquid, facultas.*' " " 2. *Libertas agendi.*'—' 3. *Auctoritas,*' &c.—' 4. *Licentia agendi et faciendi, jus.*'—Schleusner."—This citation occurs in the *Postscript*, p. 53 [517].

Now let it be observed that these significations are adduced to show that Schleusner CONTRADICTS Wakefield by assigning to the word *ἐξουσία*, BESIDES the species of power implied by *authority, privilege, and delegated commission*, the sense of POWER generally, in its FULLEST and STRONGEST import.—Which of the meanings cited by the Bishop gives this sense? Not the second, nor the third, nor the fourth; for all these peculiarly express *authority, right, privilege*. Why, then, were these cited?—We are thus reduced to the first. There is no other, in all Schleusner's fourteen significations, which bears upon the point.

But the Bishop asserts that *Trommius*, *Biel*, and *Schleusner* “support this sense of the word,” (viz. that of *power* generally, in its strongest import,) “by numerous examples.” *Trommius* does not give it at all; nor does *Biel*: and therefore to *Schleusner* alone we must look for the “numerous examples” by which this sense is supported. Under his first head he adduces four instances of the employment of the word, as denoting “*vis et potestas efficiendi aliquid, facultas* :” viz. *Matt.* ix. 8, the multitudes ‘glorified God, who had given such power (ἐξουσίαν) to men;’ *Mark* iii. 15, ‘and to have power (ἐξουσίαν) to heal sicknesses and to cast out demons;’ *Luke* xii. 5, ‘fear him who after he hath killed hath power (ἐξουσίαν) to cast into hell;’ and *Acts* viii. 19, ‘give me also this power (ἐξουσίαν).’* It is singular, that in three of these instances, the POWER is not NATURALLY INHERENT, but COMMUNICATED or DELEGATED; and that there is not one, but what may with the utmost propriety be translated *authority*. From authority or dominion, the power to accomplish our purposes arises.

I leave to the Reader to decide, whether Wakefield’s assertion, or the Bishop’s, best deserves the epithets “dogmatical and most unfounded;” and I anticipate a verdict in favour of the former, from every one competent to judge,—nay, even from the Bishop himself, when he has considered patiently

* It may be proper to add, that in No. 1. of *Schleusner* we find, after the above examples, the following remark: “Hinc ἐξουσία in N. T. interdum orationi et doctrinæ tribuitur, ut ejus vis ad persuadendum et commovendum et efficacia indicetur, v. c. *Marc.* i. 27; *Luke* iv. 32 et 36.”—In the last passage we find δύναμις joined with ἐξουσία: ‘What a word is this! for with authority and power (ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει) he commandeth the unclean spirits and they come out.’ The other two instances are of the same kind. I am not aware that they add any thing to Bishop Magee’s case.

the evidence which I have adduced, if he have escaped from the infatuation which his *Postscript* so often manifests.

Continuing his charges against Wakefield, and triumphing over him by first making him assert what he does not assert, that the original word in all cases uniformly signifies "an authority conferred by some superior," and then victoriously confuting the assertion,—the Bishop represents him as in Acts i. 7, *smuggling* the word on the English Reader, under the disguise of the term *disposal*.* There was not a particle of artifice in the nature of that upright, conscientious, and eminent Scholar: and as to the particular case, if he had here translated ἐξουσία by *authority*, it would have answered the purpose as well.—But I take leave to ask the Bishop, why, when he was thus charging Wakefield with dogmatism and artifice, and bringing Schleusner's *authority* to beat him down and with him the Editors of the Improved Version, he did not tell his Readers, that *he had himself given them only PART of SCHLEUSNER'S evidence*;—that under No. 2, LIBERTAS agendi (*quæ et Latinis POTESTAS dicitur*), Schleusner *ranks this very text* which Bishop Magee abuses Wakefield for rendering *disposal*, and translates it *quæ Pater voluit esse sui arbitrii*;—that under the same number, Schleusner places the first clause of John x. 18, rendering it *potestatem* (by which, as he just before explains it, he obviously means the same as *libertatem*) *habeo*

* The Bishop's words are as follows, with his own *Italics*, &c.
 " And here I cannot avoid an obiter observation upon the manner,
 " in which *Mr. Wakefield*, has in this last passage *smuggled* the
 " word (I can use no other appropriate phrase,) upon the *English*
 " reader, under the disguise of the term '*disposal*;' passing over
 " the text which so completely overturns his peremptory dictum,
 " in perfect silence; and taking care not to disturb his readers by
 " the information, that it was the *same original* word, that, in '*all*'
 " places, '*uniformly*' signified an *authority conferred by some su-*
 " *perior*, that we have employed in speaking of the power of the
 " FATHER."—*Postscript*, p. 54 [518].

deponendi;—and that his No. 9 is *prærogativa, dignitas*; and that under it he places John i. 12, in a manner which affords to the Editors of the Improved Version, a good justification, if any were wanting, for their changing *power* into *authority*.—“*On some subjects,*” says the Bishop, “*silence speaks loudly.*” “*The Reader will draw his own conclusions.*”

And this is the Writer who charges Mr. Belsham with “*FALSIFYING the AUTHORITY to which he refers,*” and says that “*it is scarcely possible, consistent with truth, to speak in any other terms than those which*” he had been “*compelled*” to use, of Mr. Belsham’s treatment of Schleusner’s authority “*on the word λαβειν in the passage of John x. 17, 18.*”*

Mr. Belsham and the Improved Version render λαβειν to *receive*. No person competent to read the whole verse in Greek, could doubt that this is a justifiable rendering; and authority for it was unnecessary. In the *Calm Inquiry*, however, Mr. Belsham subjoins the following citation from Schleusner. I give it “*in the precise form,*” to use the Bishop’s words, “*in which Mr. Belsham has given it, even to the inverted commas.*”

“*λαμβανω, manu aliquid capio, Matt xiv. 19: alia qua-*

* The Bishop or his Printer here gives us John i. instead of John x.—Dr. Magee says a great deal, (and repeats it,) on the Editors having, in the Introduction to the Improved Version, placed *Ephrem Syrus* in the *sixth* instead of the *fourth* century. The obvious error was first noticed, in the *Monthly Repository*, by an accurate and intelligent defender of the Improved Version, whose able and judicious communications (signed *N.*) have contributed so much to the value of that publication. He, of course, considered it, as it undoubtedly was, an error of the press or a mere inadvertency in preparing for it. Yet the Bishop and others seize upon this as a proof of the *ignorance* of the Writer. Hard-pressed must they be for proofs of his ignorance, to rest an argument of it upon such a foundation. Is it impossible, or even improbable, that he wrote *ivth*, and that the Compositor, &c., mistook it for *vith*?

cunque ratione accipio, Matt. vii. 3: rursum accipio, recuperō, Matt. xix. 29. Joh. xiii. 12." Schleusner.—The word is by no means necessarily taken in an active sense.'—*Calm Inquiry*, p. 173.

After quoting this Note, except the last clause, the Bishop proceeds with his charge of gross falsification, which I have already quoted in p. 119, and to which I request the Reader to turn before he proceeds.

Mr. Belsham's notation here is undoubtedly erroneous, since it represents the citation as a *continued quotation*. If this fact necessarily implies *criminal intention*, how deeply the Bishop is affected, in cases of a much clearer character, I have already abundantly shown. But what inducement could Mr. Belsham have had intentionally to represent his citation of Schleusner as a continued quotation? It is merely adduced to show, (though the Bishop omits *this* clause,) "that the word is by no means necessarily taken in an active sense." Mr. Belsham says nothing which can be construed to imply, that Schleusner attributed to the text before us the meaning which he himself prefers. It is certain that he never intended to intimate any thing of the kind; and it is alike certain that he had no intention to conceal Schleusner's opinion. His citation of Schleusner is solely to this point, that λαμβανω may signify *receive* as well as *take*. The Bishop somewhere says, that we may approve the criticism of Grotius, though we reject his *theology*; and this is precisely Mr. Belsham's view of Schleusner.

But, says the Bishop, "will any one believe it possible, "that, between the words '*recupero*' and '*Matt. xix. 29,*' "which are presented as immediately joined in the quotation "from Schleusner given to us by Mr. Belsham, there are "found in the original the words that follow—'*resumo, i. q.*' "παλιν λαμβανω. (John x. 17.)'?"—Certainly those may, who have considered the Bishop's own assertions respecting Biel, Trommius, and Schleusner, which I have examined in this Appendix; or who have seen him, (as I have proved that he has

repeatedly done,) terminate a quotation where the continuance of it would have destroyed the force of an argument or the point of an insinuation,—or, in order to vilify a Unitarian, frame a *continued* quotation from him, by large omissions, by insertions, and by material changes in the language. But those who know Mr. Belsham personally, and those who have examined his writings with common candour, must feel perfectly satisfied, that he had no intention to misrepresent, nor even to *conceal*, Schleusner's own opinion.

The sum of the matter is this. To show that λαμβανω may be rendered *receive*, Mr. Belsham quotes several meanings of the word from Schleusner; he also gives some of the Lexicographer's references to passages where the word occurs with these meanings. But, in the portion from which he cites, he omits various meanings, which had nothing to do with the subject of the citation; and, among them, one in which Schleusner seems to assign to λαβω, in verse 17, the “active force,” *take again*. If the question had been, how Schleusner understands the passage, Mr. Belsham would have been guilty of the same system which Bishop Magee so often employs in reference to Dr. Priestley; but it is nothing of the kind. The only error is, that the citation is loosely marked, so as to lead a person who knew nothing of Schleusner, (to whom, however, Schleusner could be no authority,) to suppose it a continued quotation, which it certainly is not. If the object and motive had been different, it might have amounted to a fraudulent abuse of authority; but of this Mr. Belsham never was guilty: as it is, it is merely an error in notation.

Yet on this slight ground, after giving a terrific representation of this inadvertency, the Bishop proceeds as follows: “Now, what shall be said of such conduct as this? *Is it too much to charge Writers who are guilty of it with DIRECT and DELIBERATE FALSEHOOD?* * Yet this is in fact the

* If it is not, the Bishop has an insupportable load lying upon

“ PREVAILING PRACTICE *with* UNITARIAN *Writers*. And these
 “ are the persons who are every where the loudest, in the pro-
 “ fession of their attachment to THE TRUTH. But it is not
 “ wonderful, that *they who are determined to RESIST and*
 “ SUBVERT *that ONE GREAT TRUTH, which our Lord came*
 “ *into the world to inculcate, should* (however loud their pre-
 “ tensions) *set but little value upon EVERY OTHER !!!*”—
Postscript, p. 60 [524].

This, Reader, is a specimen of Bishop Magee's justice ;—
 on such a foundation, to charge a Writer, (whom surely he
 must know to be incapable of it,) with direct and deliberate
 falsehood ; and then to extend this charge, without the sha-
 dow of a proof, to Unitarian Writers in general, and say that
 that on which he founds his charge, is the PREVAILING PRAC-
 TICE among them ; and to support the charge, urges against
 them another, which, if it have any meaning, would prove
 that they are destitute of every thing approaching to religious
 principle.—See also the statement in p. 244.

I readily admit that Mr. Belsham has, in this instance,
 been inattentive to those minutiae in the mode of citation,
 which often, though not here, are of great importance ; and
 which should, to prevent unintentional misunderstanding, or
 captious objections, be accurately observed, at least in all
 cases of a *controverted* nature. But the Bishop of Raphoe is
 the last person to make this the ground of so shocking an impu-
 tation. I have brought forward repeated instances, not only of
 his blending together, as one continued quotation, that which
 was derived from different sources, but of his *marking as a*
 QUOTATION *that which he had* ALTERED *and thereby made*
more objectionable, and sometimes of his giving the same cha-
 racter to that which is merely an abstract of the reasonings.
 I have adduced instances, and I might adduce still more, in

him, for he has been repeatedly guilty of it,—and this, to vilify
 and bear down an opponent.

which the Bishop is guilty of such false citations and misrepresentations of the arguments, and, what is still more inexcusable, of the very words, of the Authors whom he opposes, as would make me blush with shame for the Defenders of the ennobling cause for which I am earnestly contending, if they had dishonoured it by such means. If we sink in the scale of learning below those who possess advantages from which we are debarred, because we cannot conscientiously profess the doctrines or unite habitually in the worship of the Church of England, we are satisfied with endeavouring to make a faithful use of what we have. The advantages to be derived from the paltry arts of mere controversy, we gladly leave to those who want them. When we employ them as they are employed in the volumes of Bishop Magee, and especially in the last and in every respect the worst, we shall be contented to sink under the opprobrious stigma of falsehood and fraud with which he aims to brand us; but our consciences tell us that we shall have thus dishonoured that cause, which we solemnly believe to be the cause of truth, of Christ, and of God.

To prevent all misapprehension, I wish here to add, in connection with my strictures in p. 391, that though Bishop Magee asserts, before the quotations from *Schleusner* on *ἐξουσία*, that *Trommius*, *Biel*, and *Schleusner*, assign to this “word the sense of power generally, in its fullest and strongest import;” yet, immediately after the quotation, he says “*Trommius* and *Biel*” “can discover” in the use of *ἐξουσία* by the Seventy, &c., “no other meanings than *Potestas*, “*Dominium*, *Imperium*, *Dominatio*.” Now not one of these conveys the sense of POWER “in its fullest and strongest import:” for this, *POTENTIA* would have been used by *Trommius* and *Biel*, as in *δυναμὶς*.

APPENDIX C.

On the Use made by Bishop MAGEE of the Unitarian Reviewer's Statements respecting the Variations of the IMPROVED VERSION from GRIESBACH's Text; and on the System adopted with regard to the Greek Text, by recent Critics and Editors.

The Unitarian Reviewer (see p. 308) has supplied Bishop Magee with some of his shafts against the Improved Version, in connection with the original Text. He only wishes the Bishop would have used them fairly.—In the *Postscript*, p. 13 [477], quoting from Dr. Nares's *Remarks*, p. 8, he says “ that the “ Unitarian Writer regrets that no standard text had been “ adhered to, ‘ because ’ (says he) ‘ it would do away one of the “ ‘ most powerful charges brought against us, viz. that we “ ‘ alter the Scriptures to suit our own system.’ ”—I have not changed my opinion, that it would have been much better for the Improved Version invariably to have adhered to the text of Griesbach's second edition; and it has been satisfactory to me to perceive, that great though not uniformly successful attention has been paid, in the 4th Edition of the Improved Version, in order to follow that text, in its (commonly minute) variations from that of his first edition. But the Unitarian Reviewer did not go so far as to regret that no standard text had been adhered to; and at the close of the *Table of Passages in which the Improved Version leaves the Text of Griesbach's SECOND Edition*, (*Month. Rep.* 1809, p. 737,) he expressly says, (lest “ a too cursory inspection of the Table should lead any one to conclusions unfavourable to the Improved Version and to its Editors,”) “ The Editors have in “ no instance stated their determination to abide by the text “ of Griesbach's 2d Edition; and a very large proportion, “ probably a very large MAJORITY of the variations which we

“ have noticed, *have originated in NEWCOME’s departures*
 “ *from Griesbach’s FIRST edition, or in GRIESBACH’s own al-*
 “ *terations upon it in his SECOND.* Hence,” the Reviewer
 continues, “ unless the Editors had set out with the above-
 “ mentioned determination, those variations must follow of
 “ course : *and these are, in general, of so minute a kind, that,*
 “ *in themselves considered, they are of no consequence.*”

Yet, notwithstanding all this, which if Bishop Magee did not know he ought to have known, we find the following statements respecting the “ fabrication of the word ‘ God ’ ” in Hebr. xii. 25, (see above, p. 334) : “ That JUST CAUSE
 “ *existed for the charge brought against the Unitarians, of*
 “ ALTERING THE SCRIPTURES TO SUIT THEIR OWN SYSTEM,
 “ *seems plainly admitted by one of themselves, as we have*
 “ seen at page 477 [13] of this volume; where (with an
 “ ingenuousness not exactly characteristic of the Sect,) the
 “ Writer confesses and regrets, that they have followed ‘ no
 “ *standard text’ whatever ; that is, in other words, that they*
 “ *have modified the text of the N. T. just as they found it*
 “ *answerable to their purpose.*”—Now on this passage I observe (1) ‘ That the words “ no standard text,” though to every Reader they must appear the words of the Reviewer, are the words of Dr. Nares ; and (2) ‘ The Unitarian Reviewer utterly disclaims Bishop Magee’s *paraphrase* of what he has said ; and he never admitted, “ that JUST CAUSE existed for the charge :” he never could have admitted this, because he knew it to be unfounded.

As to the departure of the Improved Version from Griesbach’s 2d Edition, the Unitarian Reviewer, of whose statements the Bishop has made so illiberal a use, could not possibly have confessed that the Editors “ have modified the Text of
 “ the New Testament just as they found it answerable to their
 “ purpose ;” for, as he *had* examined the matter, he must, in that case, have confessed what he *knew* to be false. And if Bishop Magee had considered the evidence which the Reviewer gave him, he might have been preserved from such an

unjust imputation upon him. Passing by the occasional injudicious employment of the brackets, (see above, p. 319,) there is not, throughout the Gospels and the Acts, a single instance of doctrinal importance, in which the Improved Version leaves Griesbach; and, throughout the Epistles, there are only three variations of doctrinal importance. These are, Rom iii. 25, where the Improved Version, (in my judgment on very inadequate authority,) omits *δια της πιστεως*, while Griesbach reads *δια = της : πιστεως*, (marking *της* as very suspicious); 1 Cor. xv. 47, where the Improved Version has, ‘the second man *will be* from heaven [heavenly],’ but Griesbach, as Newcome renders his text, has ‘the second man *will be* [the Lord] from heaven;’ and 2 Tim. iii. 16, where the Improved Version rejects *και*, rendering ‘All Scripture given by inspiration of God *is* profitable,’ &c.; in which, according to Newcome’s Note, the Editors agree with the “Syriac, the three Arabic Versions, the Vulgate, Grotius, the English Bible of 1549, &c.” To these instances some will add 1 Cor. x. 9; but there it can scarcely be said to leave Griesbach, as will appear in the next division of this Appendix.

I deny then, absolutely, the admission *attributed* to the Unitarian Reviewer, that JUST CAUSE existed for the once-common charge against the Unitarians; and, in particular, that he “confesses,” “*in other words, that they*” the EDITORS “*have modified the Text of the New Testament just as they found it answerable to their purpose.*”

The charge spoken of by the Reviewer rests with real force upon the critical system of some in the present day, who are endeavouring to support the cause of Orthodoxy by maintaining the genuineness of a passage which, till recently, was admitted by almost every one who had pretensions to the character of a Critic, to be “INDISPUTABLY SPURIOUS.” I scarcely need say, I refer to the text of the Three Heavenly Witnesses, 1 John v. 7, 8. Mr. NOLAN (*Inq.* p. 564) declares that he cannot “*discover any thing which materially affects*” “*the authenticity of the verse;*” and the learned Rector of

Killesandra, though he had before avowed his conviction that Griesbach's judgment is right, now declares that he embraces, "with assurance, the belief of the *authenticity* and *integrity* of the received text." (*Faith in the Holy Trinity*, vol. ii. p. 134.) What Dr. Hales means by the *authenticity*, in contradistinction from the *integrity*, of the received reading of this passage, I do not know; but I certainly consider his "δεύτεραι φροντίδες" as a complete proof that the maxim, *Second thoughts are best*, is by no means always well founded.*

* Bishop Magee affords us a corresponding instance of a want of precision in his terms, even where he is correcting others. He maintains (*Poster.* p. 322) that the Unitarians "desire to get rid of" the Introductory Chapters in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke "at all hazards and against all evidence, because they "are resolved not to believe the facts which these chapters contain." It may be suspected that the Bishop knows practically something of a *RESOLUTION not to believe*; but I can assure him I am not aware of its existence among Unitarians. He proceeds, "Why will not the Unitarian Critics learn to distinguish between "the *authenticity* and *credibility* of the writings of the New Testament? Or, rather, I should say, of *some* of them, why will they "purposely confound them?" The Bishop must mean the *genuineness* and the *credibility* of those writings. Their *authenticity* chiefly respects the *truth of the facts* recorded in them; and if *authentic*, I presume they must be *credible*. To maintain the *genuineness* of any book or portion of a book, is to maintain that it was written by the person to whom it is ascribed. To deny its *genuineness*, in reference to prevalent opinion, does not necessarily imply a conviction of its *spuriousness*. I cannot regard the Epistle to the Hebrews as written by St. Paul; but, so far from considering it as *spurious*, I look upon it as the genuine and very valuable production of a Hebrew Christian, possessed of authority and influence in the Church, and as indisputably written before the destruction of Jerusalem. (See p. 90.)—Mr. Kingdon, however, to whose translation of *Less Bp. M.* refers, uses the term *authenticity* to include the *genuineness* and *integrity* of the books of the N. T., and these alone.

I trust that we shall not find Dr. PYS SMITH, (in the second volume of his *Scripture Testimony* just announced,) pursuing this retrograde course. At any rate, I have great pleasure in quoting what the Eclectic Reviewer (March 1809) says on the subject. “The last of these three observable passages is the “celebrated 1 John v. 7, 8. Upon this we need not spend “many words. It is found in no Greek MS. ancient or “recent, except one to which we shall presently advert,” (referring to the Dublin MS. which *cannot* be placed earlier than the 14th century;)—“in no ancient Version, being “interpolated only in the later transcripts of the Vulgate. “Not one of the *Greek* Fathers recognizes it, though many “of them collect every species and shadow of argument, down “to the most allegorical and shockingly ridiculous, in favour “of the doctrine of the Trinity,—though they often cite the “words immediately contiguous both before and after,—and “though with immense labour and art they extract from the “next words the very sense which this passage has in follow- “ing times been adduced to furnish. Of the *Latin* Fathers, “not one has quoted it till Eucherius of Lyons in the middle “of the vth century, and in his works *there is much reason to “believe that it has been interpolated.*

“Under these circumstances, we are unspeakably ashamed “that any modern divine should have fought *pedibus et un- “guibus* for the retention of a passage so INDISPUTABLY “SPURIOUS.”—*Ecl. Rev.* for Mar. 1809, p. 248.

The Critic afterwards says, “They are, in our esteem, the “best advocates of the Trinitarian doctrine, who join in ex- “ploding such a GROSS INTERPOLATION, and in protesting

* “It has been attempted to be shown, that Tertullian and “Cyprian have cited the last clause of ver. 7. Our Readers may “be satisfied on this subject, by referring to Griesb. Nov. Test. “vol. ii. App. p. 13—15; or Porson’s Letters to Travis, 240—282; “or Marsh’s Michaelis, vol. iv. 421—424. See also, for a lamen- “table contrast, Travis’s Letters, 3d ed. 82, 53, 75—128.”

“ against its being still permitted to occupy a place in the
 “ common copies of the New Testament.”—*Ibid.* p. 249.

For some time it was customary, among all who had any pretension to critical knowledge, to applaud Griesbach's Text and to adopt it. Every one who studied his *Prolegomena*, even without entering into further details, perceived that his system was marked by sound discriminating caution ; and that, taking into account the great variety of testimonies which he had before him, the skill he manifested in the arrangement and appreciation of them, the aids afforded him by preceding Critics, the sound canons by which he estimated the external and internal evidence of the various readings, and the inexhaustible patience, indefatigable labour, and cool judgment, with which he applied those canons, there was the greatest probability of being right, in taking his Text as the *standard*. There was still the evidence ready for examination in every case of doubt.

On this principle, Archbishop NEWCOMB appears to have proceeded, in selecting Griesbach's Text as the basis of his Revision. Archdeacon WOODHOUSE followed it in his Translation of the Apocalypse. In 1808 appeared, from the Oxford University Press, a beautiful and correct edition of the Greek Testament, edited by Professor WHITE, in which he exhibits all the various readings which, in the judgment of Griesbach, are superior or equal to those of the Received Text ; and, to the best of my recollection, employs the former in his own Text. This learned and judicious Professor, two or three years after, published his *Criseos Griesbachianæ in Novum Testamentum Synopsis*. The title of this unexpensive and very useful volume misled me, and may have misled others. I supposed it to be a statement of Griesbach's critical *principles* ; but it is simply an abstract of all the *readings* which Griesbach prefers to those of the Received Text, or to which he prefixes any mark denoting his appreciation of their value. To those who have only access to editions giving the Received

Text, or to those which of late have unhappily been sent before the Public with partial and injudicious alterations, *White's Synopsis* will be found of material service, by enabling them, in all cases, to know what really is Griesbach's Text, and what readings he deems of great importance, or of some consideration.—I should, on various occasions, have found Professor White's *Synopsis* very serviceable, even with Griesbach constantly before me; and I beg leave to recommend the little volume, to those especially who have not the power of consulting Griesbach.

Somewhere about the same period, Griesbach's second Edition was reprinted in England; one volume at Oxford and the other in London: and, rather recently, another impression of the same work has proceeded from the press of Messrs. R. and A. Taylor, for which, I believe, they alone are answerable, and for the correctness of which, therefore, their well-known learning and accuracy are a sufficient pledge.

And here, for the present, the before-extending and rising estimation of Griesbach's Text by the British Public is at a stand; except, indeed, among those who are not to be led away by popular clamour, whether it arises from the mob, or from the seats of learning. Orthodoxy has taken the alarm; and though the name of Griesbach does not appear to have lost all its celebrity, few are so daring now as to follow him, *where DOCTRINE is concerned*. All I wish is, that those who have not fortitude enough to follow him throughout, would be contented with that corrupt text which is still (though it cannot long be) the *Textus RECEPTUS*. But to use Griesbach's name, and not to follow his Text, is in my judgment a serious departure from the laws of Christian uprightness.

But the Reader will ask, Is it ever done?—I wish it were not; but the fact is as I have intimated.

In 1809, an edition of the Greek Testament was published with the following Title: “ Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη. *Novum Testamentum Græcum, juxta exemplar Wetstenii Glasguæ, et D. Jo. Jac. Griesbachii, Halæ impressum; accedunt Prolegomena*

in *Evangelia, in Acta et Epistolos Apostolorum. Accuranti Gulielmo Whitfield Dakins, LL. D. Societ. Antiq. Lond. Socio; Sancti Petri Westmon. Precentore. Editio stereotypa.*" It is dedicated to the *Archbishop of Canterbury*. This circumstance led me to hope, that the time was arrived when the interpolations which disgrace the Received Text would be abandoned; since the Primate of all England had suffered an Edition founded on Griesbach's Text to be published under his auspices. That the *separation* of the text into verses is retained in Dr. Dakins's edition, did not however augur well; and this excited my suspicions. I soon found, that neither *Wetstein's* name, nor *Griesbach's*, ought to have been employed; that the glaring interpolation in 1 John v. 7, 8, is retained, without the slightest intimation that it never appeared in *Greek* till above a thousand years after the Epistle was written; and that, in various other passages, where system has no concern, it does not follow Griesbach where he leaves the Received Text. How could any man of learning superintend, and an Archbishop in any way sanction, so unjustifiable a publication? What is there that the Unitarians ever have even been *charged* with doing, which demands so much the heavy censure of 'handling the word of God deceitfully?'

In the Monthly Repository for 1817, p. 390, is a "Critical Notice of *Duncan's Edition of Griesbach*," by that Friend to whom I was indebted for the collation of the Improved Version with Newcome's Revision, which I have repeatedly referred to. (See p. 309, &c.) This Edition has in its Title-page, "*Curâ Leusdenii et Griesbachii.*" The only peculiarity of *Leusden's* Editions, is the employment of certain marks to denote words which occur only once in the New Testament, or words for the first time occurring which are employed more frequently. These marks are not employed in *Duncan's* Edition. As to Griesbach, he is either followed or neglected, *ad libitum*. "So far," says the Critic, "from finding this Edition a valuable aid to the biblical scholar and a benefit to the

“ sacred interests of religion, it is found to have been conducted *with the grossest partiality to preconceived theological opinions*, to bid defiance to any system of selection, and to be a *confused mixture of the Received Text, of Griesbach, and of other readings, adopted in part from both.*” In short, he describes it as an Edition in which Griesbach is FOLLOWED in all readings of no importance, and REJECTED, where his alterations might be supposed to offend against popular doctrines and prejudices.” In this light he represents it, and most justly, as “ an unworthy artifice.” If a person chooses to make up a text of his own, let him say so; but do not let him use Griesbach’s name, and leave Griesbach wherever, in opposition to doctrinal prepossessions; that honest Editor followed the course of evidence. The fairest way is, to leave the Received Text with all its faults, or to alter it without reference to symbols of faith.

Duncan’s Edition is issued into the world, without any further information respecting the text, than the Title supplies, “ *Curâ Leusdenii et Griesbachii.*” I think I can explain its origin. I have before me a Leyden Edition, which I purchased on the faith of its Title, “ *Secundum Curam J. Leusdenii et Griesbachii editum ab Henrico Arnoldo Aitton, 1809.*” On comparing my Friend’s specifications of the Glasgow Text with that of the Leyden Edition, I am led to regard DUNCAN’S as a reprint of AITTON’S, with the omission of Leusden’s *notulæ*. But Aitton tells us what he has done. He informs us that Griesbach is a most eminent Editor, and his emendations of the greatest value, and that he has therefore followed him AS FAR AS WAS ALLOWABLE AND POSSIBLE; but that in *some places* he has retained the Received Text where HE thought it preferable to Griesbach’s.* Where he

* “ Cum Griesbachii cura in Textu sacro quam plurimum valeat, et hujus Viri Celeberrimi emendationes sese quam max-

leaves Griesbach, he does not say, but we find that it happens to be *WHEREVER Orthodoxy puts her veto upon the unbiassed decisions of Criticism*. And yet Aitton has the shamelessness to call his text, *Griesbachii Textus*. All that can be said in his favour is, that he tells us that he does leave it, where he thinks the common reading preferable. The *Duncans* take this mangled text of Griesbach; but they do not say who mangled it, on what authority, or to what extent. It might be mere ignorance in them; but it is lamentable ignorance. If it were intentional, it is a fraud of the most criminal nature.

I have now to notice an Edition proceeding from one who is above such ignorance, but whom his own theological prepossessions, or, I fear, the worldly wisdom of those whose interest was involved in the popularity of the Edition, or both influences united, have prompted to pursue *Aitton's* course, and to follow Griesbach only "*quantum licuit et fieri potuit*:" I refer to the Rev. EDWARD VALPY's Edition of the Greek Testament, in 3 vols. 8vo., "*cum Scholiis Theologicis et Philologicis*." This Edition was announced some years before it was published; and the advertisements stated that Griesbach's Text would be followed. It was, in consequence, suggested to Mr. Valpy the Printer, that Griesbach's own Prolegomena, prefixed to his minor *Leipsic* Edition of 1805, (which in 1809 was reprinted at Cambridge in New England,

me commendent, visum quoque fuit hanc nostram Editionem *quantum licuit et fieri potuit*, conservatâ tamen in nonnullis locis receptâ lectione, quæ nobis *Griesbachianæ anteferenda videbatur*, ad illas adornare, ita ut GRIESBACHII TEXTUS hic prodeat in formâ Editionis Leusdenii, atque adeo, tum juventuti, tum aliis, in Græco sermone versatis, consultum sit." *Præf.* p. viii.—Here, then, we have AITTON's judgment, without reasons, and even without specification of his variations, against GRIESBACH's own critical decisions!

with great fidelity and correctness, by Messrs. Wells and Hilliard,) might be of material service in his Uncle's projected Edition. On the faith of the preparatory advertisements, a copy was procured, which I have lying before me. The Title-page says nothing about the Text; but Mr. Valpy's Preface at once sets the matter at rest. He tells us that *he has retained the received readings in many cases where he thought the evidence for them superior to that of Griesbach's Text.* We have here then VALPY's judgment against GRIESBACH's; just as in the before-stated case of AITTON: and I am concerned to add, sometimes *without reasons assigned*, and at others *against reasons*. Indeed, as will appear from an extract from his Preface which I will give below, Mr. Valpy has been studying in Aitton's critical school.* I would have

* "Lectionibus vulgo receptis, quibus quotidianâ consuetudine, assiduitate, et veneratione præ ceteris assueveram, ita favi, ut eas, quamdiu ratio testimoniorum permiserit, obnixè, tanquam castellum ab hostibus oppugnatum, defenderim, nec, nisi extremâ vi compulsus, et perpaucis quidem tantum locis, deditionem fecerim. *Attamen cum Griesbachii cura in textum sacrum collata quam plurimum valeat, et viri celeberrimi emendationes sese quam maxime commendent, visum est hanc nostram editionem, QUANTUM LICUIT ET FIERI POTUIT, conservatâ in quam plurimis locis ad receptâ lectionem, quæ, validissimis rationibus et testimoniis trutinâ examinatis, NOBIS Griesbachianæ anteferenda videretur, ad illas adornare; ita nimirum ut optime tum veræ fidei et Christianæ doctrinæ, tum pietati consultum foret.*" *Præf. Valp. p. v.*

The Reader cannot fail to be struck with the correspondence between Aitton's and Valpy's Prefaces, in the parts in Italics. I was not aware of the circumstance till I had made the extract from Aitton in the last Note. Mr. Valpy does not proceed, as Aitton disgracefully does, to call *his* the Griesbach Text; but the 12mo Edition of the Greek Testament, printed *In Ædibus Valpianis*, which is taken from the text of the above 8vo Edition, (but for which the Rev. *Edward Valpy* is in no way responsible,) is said to

recommended to him, unless he could have resolved to follow Griesbach thoroughly, as Griesbach follows critical truth, to have let Griesbach alone entirely, and to have satisfied himself with giving the Received Text, and noticing in his Notes all the various readings which he thought of authority and at the same time to be *ALLOWED by a regard to the doctrines of the Church of England*, with which he expresses the earnest hope that he has said nothing inconsistent, or, if he has, he declares that he wishes to unsay and retract it.

On examination into particulars, we find Mr. Valpy clinging to every reading which Orthodoxy stamps as her own. The *ratio testimoniorum* is always overbalanced by the *analogia fidei*. He tells us, indeed, that we ought always to examine the ancient testimonies with strict impartiality, “*sine discrimine aut studio partium* ;” but as Griesbach’s evidence and decision are sometimes admitted against the Received Text, they surely ought not to be rejected where the evidence is much stronger, merely because Orthodoxy wants their support. If the question of the genuineness of an uncertain passage is to be decided by its conformity to a standard of faith, let criticism alone: if by evidence, let criticism settle the matter, without considering how it affects doctrine. The text is not to be carved to the doctrine; but the doctrine tried by the genuine text.

That I might have full satisfaction in my judgment as to Mr. Valpy’s Text, I have compared it with that of Griesbach (principally by the aid of White’s *Synopsis*) in a variety of instances; and I submit the details to the Reader.

In the following cases I have found Griesbach followed, in his variations from the Received Text; viz. *Matt.* *v. 27; *vi. 1; vii. 2; viii. 5, 8, 32; *x. 23; xi. 16; xii. 35; xv. 8;

be *Juxta Exemplar PRÆCIPUE Griesbachianum*; and all the doctrinal interpolations and corruptions of the Received Text are thus perpetuated, and with less chance of reformation, than if the Received Text had been left untouched.

xx. 22, 23; xxv. 13; xxvi. 60: *Luke* *ii. 33; iii. 2: *Acts* ii. 30; vi. 3, 8, 13; vii. 14, 16, 20, 31, 48; viii. 7, 13, 18; *ix. 20: *Phil.* iii. 16: *Col.* ii. 11; *iii. 15: 1 *Thess.* iii. 2; 2 *Thess.* ii. 2, 4: 1 *Tim.* i. 4, *17; ii. 7; iii. 3; iv. 12; v. 4; vi. 19: *Hebr.* *xii. 20: 1 *John* *ii. 23: *Jude* *4, *25: *Rev.* *i. 8; ii. 15; *v. 14; viii. 7, *13; xi. 17; xiv. *1, 5; xv. 3; xxii. 19, 21.

Several of the above I examined, as being readings of some moment; but many merely to ascertain the principle upon which Mr. Valpy had proceeded in constructing his text. On those to which I have prefixed an asterisk, some remarks may be made, principally to show what weight Mr. Valpy has sometimes given to *external* evidence.

† MATT. v. 27. R. T. τοις αρχαιοις—Gr. *rejects*—Valpy *rejects them also, and says in his Note*, “*Quæ verba Erasmus invitis codicibus temere in editionem suam transtulit.*”

† ——— vi. 1. R. T. ελεημοσυνην—Gr. δικαιοσυνην—V. δικαιοσυνην. “*Plurimi Codd. habent δ. pro ε. Istam igitur lectionem Gr. plane pro genuina habet.*”

——— x. 23. R. T. φευγετε εις την αλλην—Gr. *after την adds, with his mark of high probability, έτεφαν καν εκ ταυτης διωκωσιν ύμας, φευγετε εις την*—Valpy *inserts these words in his text in brackets.*

LUKE ii. 33. R. T. Ιωσηφ και η μητηρ αυτου—Gr. ο πατηρ αυτου και η μητηρ—V. *follows Gr. in the text; but in the Note speaks, as Gr. also does, of the high probability of the received reading.*

ACTS ix. 20. R. T. Χριστον—Gr. Ιησουν—V. *follows Gr. in this important reading: the received reading is frivolous.*

COL. iii. 15. R. T. Θεου—Gr. Χριστου—V. Χριστου “*quam lectionem exhibent Codd. Patr. et Verss. magnæ auctoritatis.*”

1 TIM. i. 17. R. T. μονω σοφω Θεω—Gr. *rejects σοφω*—V. *also rejects σοφω* “*deest in plurimis et optimis Codd. Verss. et Patribus, Gr. et Lat.*”

† HEBR. xii. 20. R. T. η βολιδι κατοξευθησεται—Gr. *rejects*—V. *also rejects*: “*recte omittuntur; desunt enim in optimis Codd. Verss. et Patribus.*”

1 JOHN ii. 23. R. T. πατερα εχει—Gr. *adds after these words with his mark of high probability, ο ομολογων τον υιον και τον πατερα σχει*—V. *adopts this addition.*

JUDE 4. R. T. τον μονον δεσποτην Θεον—Gr. rejects Θεον—V. also rejects it; “deest in multis opt. Codd. Verss. et Patribus.”

— 25. R. T. μονω σοφω Θεω σωτηρι ημων—Gr. rejects σοφω and adds after ημων with the mark of high probability δια Ιησου Χριστου του Κυριου ημων—V. rejects σοφω, and mentions the addition in his Note; but does not follow the system he adopted in Matt. x. 23, and 1 John ii. 23, by introducing it into his Text, in the latter case without any mark in the text.

REV. i. 8. R. T. αρχη και τελος—Gr. rejects, and for ο Κυριος reads Κυριος ο Θεος—V. follows Gr. in this important reading; but seems to refer the verse to the Son.—For his remarkable departure in v. 11 from Gr., see below.

— v. 14. R. T. ζωντι εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων—Gr. rejects; so also Valpy, who says that this shorter reading denotes that the adoration was offered ‘to Him that sitteth on the throne and to the Lamb.’

† — viii. 13. R. T. αγγελου πετωμενου—Gr. αετου πετομενου, which reading Valpy adopts and says in his Note, “testes antiquissimi, sæculis et climatibus inter se remotissimi et longe plurimi, ab omni glossæ suspicione vindicant.”

— xiv. 1. R. T. ονομα του πατρος—Gr. adds after ονομα, αυτου και το ονομα, which fuller reading Valpy adopts, but without notice of the alteration in his Note. This is the case with other readings in the Revelation: e. g. xiv. 5; xv. 3; xxii. 19, 21.

Several of the foregoing quotations show, that on some occasions Mr. Valpy is willing to be decided by the evidence of Manuscripts, Versions, and Fathers. I particularly beg the Reader’s attention to those marked with †. That on Rev. viii. 13, is remarkably strong; and proves that, in a case where doctrinal rectitude is not concerned, Mr. Valpy is not afraid to state and follow evidence. Comparing Jude 25 with 1 John ii. 23, we discern a disposition which the textual Critic should suppress altogether. He should be like the worthy Magistrate of Amsterdam, who, when pointing out to some illustrious stranger the various places of worship in his city, spoke in terms of discriminating and impartial approbation of the respective denominations; and on being asked by the stranger to which he himself belonged, he replied, “Sir,

I am Burgomaster of Amsterdam."—In forming his text, Mr. Valpy seems to have forgotten, that his object should have been, to determine what came from the pen of the sacred Writer, not what suits the *taste* or the *sentiments* of the Theological World at present. That he has not been faithful in the responsibility he undertook, I am obliged to maintain on several parts of the following evidence, compared with the cases in which he *has* departed from the Received Text.

MATT. vi. 13. Gr. *rejects the Doxology*: Valpy inserts it in brackets; and gives some account of the evidence against it.

— ix. 13. Gr. *rejects* εἰς μετανοίαν: Valpy retains it in the Text; but notices the evidence against it in the Note, though he considers it as insufficient.

* — xix. 17. R. T. Τι με λεγεις αγαθον; ουδεις αγαθος, ει μη εἰς ὁ Θεος—Gr. Τι με ερωτας περι του αγαθου; εἰς εστιν αγαθος—Valpy retains the common reading "quæ præferenda videtur, et quod congruet cum Marco et Luca."

— xxvii. 35. Gr. *omits* ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ νόμος τοῦ κληρονόμου—V. retains it in brackets.

MARK vi. 11. Gr. *omits* ἀμην ὁ νόμος τοῦ κληρονόμου—V. retains it in brackets.

* LUKE iv. 18. Gr. *omits* ἰασασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τὴν καρδίαν—V. retains the clause without any mark in the Text; but in his Note says "omittuntur in Codd. Verss. and Patr. haud paucis."

* — ix. 55. Gr. *omits* the last clause ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς κ'τλ' and prefixes = to the preceding clause, καὶ εἶπεν οὐκ κ'τλ'.

JOHN v. 3, 4. Gr. prefixes = to ἐκδεχομένων κ'τλ' ὁ νόμος τοῦ κληρονόμου—V. takes no notice of its doubtfulness; but his plan does not appear to have led him to notice probable omissions. The same remark may be made as to John vii. 53—viii. 11.

— vi. 69. R. T. συ εἰ Χριστός, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζωντος—Gr. συ εἰ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ—V. TAKES NO NOTICE of this important reading. Peter's fuller confession in Matt. xvi. 16, was subsequent to this.—In this same verse V. follows Gr. in omitting οὐν.—Aitton has here a compound reading, one of his own I believe, συ εἰ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζωντος.*

* Though Aitton has in this instance, and in Hebr. x, 34 (τοῖς

ACTS viii. 37. Gr. rejects εἶπε on to Χριστόν—V. retains the passage, but notices its omission in some ancient authorities.

— xx. 28. R. T. τοῦ Θεοῦ—τοῦ ἰδίου αἱματος—Gr. reads τῷ Κυρίου—τοῦ αἱματος τοῦ ἰδίου—V. TAKES NO NOTICE of the first important reading; but adopts the second as “lectio optimis codd. freta.” The first rests on still stronger evidence. “On seriously “weighing all the evidence,” says the Eclectic Reviewer, “every

θεσμίῳ μου), most unaccountably blended together the R. T. and Griesbach's, yet, as a whole, his Text appears to be vastly nearer Griesbach's than Valpy's is. Out of sixty-five passages in which I have examined his readings, I only find the following where he deserts Griesbach for the R. T.; viz. *Matt.* vi. 13; *Acts* viii. 37 (retaining the verse); ix. 20 (where Valpy more wisely follows Gr.); xx. 28 (where, like Valpy, he follows Gr. at the end of the verse, and neglects him in the important point); *Rom.* viii. 1; *Eph.* iv. 13; *Phil.* iv. 13; *1 Tim.* iii. 16; *1 John* v. 7, 8. In the following readings of some importance, he abides by Gr. where Valpy leaves him. *Matt.* ix. 13; xix. 17; xxvii. 35; *Mark* vi. 11; *Luke* iv. 18; ix. 55; *Acts* viii. 37; *Rom.* xii. 11; *1 Cor.* xi. 24; *Eph.* iii. 9; *Col.* i. 2, 14; ii. 2; *1 John* iv. 3; v. 13; *Jude* 25; *Rev* i. 11.

If I have discovered Aitton's chief variations from Griesbach, and the *Duncans* have, as I suspect, merely reprinted his Edition, they might make their text truly Griesbachian by cancelling a few leaves: and in default of this, they might *prefix* a leaf of explanation, and specify the instances in which their text had left Griesbach, by unfortunately following that of Aitton, whose authority is of no value. Professor *White's Synopsis* would enable any person of tolerable skill and care, easily to detect all their departures from Griesbach.

Every Editor of the Gr. Test. should lay it down as a principle, to correct the Received Text EVERY where or NO where (except perhaps in the spurious passage in *1 John* v. 7, 8, which should, by every one, have a mark set upon it); and if GRIESBACH's name is used by any Editor, he ought to follow him THROUGHOUT, with his own HONESTY and FIRMNESS.

“impartial mind, we conceive, will admit that the last (Κυρίου)
“has the fairest claim for acceptance as the genuine reading.”

ROM. viii. 1. Gr. rejects the last clause *μη κατα κ.τ.λ.*—V. retains it, but with notice of its doubtfulness.

—xii. 11. R. T. Κυριω—Gr. καιρω—V. retains Κυριω and assigns strong evidence for it; but passes by that on the other side.

1 COR. xi. 24. Gr. rejects λαβετε, φαγετε—V. retains without notice.

EPH. iii. 9. Gr. rejects *δια Ιησου Χριστου*—V. retains WITHOUT NOTICE.—So also Phil. iv. 13. Χριστω: Col. i. 2. και Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου: 1 John iv. 3. Χριστον εν σαρκι εληλυθота: 1 John v. 13. τοις πιστευουσιν εις το ονομα του υιου του Θεου.

COL. i 14. Gr. rejects *δια του αιματος αυτου*, which is probably derived from Eph. i. 7.—V. retains, but briefly states the evidence of their dubiousness. His reason for retaining them is remarkable: “Efficacius illustrant απολυτρωσιν.”

1 TIM. iii. 16. R. T. Θεος εφανερωθη—Gr. ‘Ος εφανερωθη—V. follows the R. T. WITHOUT ANY INTIMATION that its reading is uncertain. The Eclectic Reviewer prefers *ός*.

HEBR. x. 34. R. T. δεσμοις μου—Gr. δεσμοις—V. follows the R. T. WITHOUT NOTICE of Gr.’s important reading, though he follows him in omitting *εν* before *εαυτοις*.

1 JOHN v. 7, 8. Gr. rejects *εν τω ουρανω, ο πατηρ, ο λογος, και το αγιον πνευμα και ουτοι οι τρεις εν ειναι. Και τρεις ειναι οι μαρτυρουντες εν τη γη*—Valpy retains this “GROSS INTERPOLATION” (see above, p. 403), without even inserting it in brackets, and without at all explaining the nature, degree, variety, and extent of the evidence which proves it to be “INDISPUTABLY SPURIOUS.”—Mr. Valpy simply informs his Readers, that most Critics of the present day regard the passage as not genuine; that many things oppose its genuineness; but that, on the other hand, many most learned Commentators defend it, and have vindicated its genuineness by various arguments. The only reason he assigns for retaining it, is, *that the context appears very bald and incomplete without it!* “Istis verbis e textu sublatis, nescio quid curti et inexpleti semper mihi apparuit.”—Is this following the Apostle’s example, *εν απλοτητι και ειλικρινεια Θεου, ουκ εν σοφια σαρκικη, —ανεστραφημεν εν τω κοσμω?*

The contemporary Advocates for this gross interpolation cannot

surely have examined and weighed Griesbach's *Diatrise* at the end of his second volume. Those who have not, have no right, in the present period of Scriptural Criticism, to expect the examination of their arguments. *It is their business to confute GRIESBACH*; not ours to confute them. When they have accomplished their object, they may next proceed to establish the genuineness of the *Epistle to the Laodiceans* (see *Jones on the Canon*, P. III. ch. vi.), or of the *Acts of Pilate* (ch. xxviii.), in which, and in any thing else in which they have ancient testimony against them, they may then be successful. It is really melancholy to see learned Christian divines, exposing the evidence for the genuineness of the New Testament generally to suspicion and contempt, by contending for this passage; and, were I on their side the question, I should, with Dr. Pye Smith, be "unspeakably ashamed" of their system.

After having irrefragably proved that this passage is spurious, and maintained that it rests principally, if not solely, on the testimony and authority of *Vigilius Tapsensis*, a base forger of the fifth century, the veteran Critic, GRIESBACH, thus declares his opinion at the close of his decisive *Diatrise*. "If testimonies so few in number, so suspicious in credit, and so recent in date, may be allowed to establish the genuineness of any reading, although opposed by evidence and arguments numerous and important, there is no longer, in criticism, any criterion of truth and falsehood, and the whole text of the New Testament must be entirely uncertain (*textus Novi Testamenti universus plane incertus esset et dubius*). If the evidence for this passage be allowed such weight, I could establish six hundred readings which are in the utmost degree absurd, and which every one rejects, by testimonies and arguments equal, and even superior in number and authority, to those adduced by the supporters of this passage." "Hoc velim," (he concludes,) "probe perpendant qui novam fortasse commatis istius defensionem in se suscipere volent, licet nuper Knittelii acumen, Hezelii sagacitas, et Travisii ζηλος (sed ου κατ' επιγνωσιν ideoque a viris doctissimis, Porsono et Marshio, ut par erat, repressus et castigatus,) in vindicando hoc versu frustra irritoque conatu (ut postmodum Hezelius, utpote Vir veri amantissimus, ultro et ingenue professus ipse est,) elaboraverint."

I have only one other passage to cite from Mr. Valpy's Edition, viz.

REV. i. 11. where Gr. rejects Εγω ειμι το Α και το Ω, ὁ πρῶτος και ὁ εσχάτος και (upon authority very little short of that on which he rejects αρχη και τέλος in ver. 8, and much the same as that on which he rejects ταις εν Ασια in this very verse). Mr. Valpy retains the above words in his text without the indication of doubtfulness which he has employed in some other places; and contents himself with some indefinite remarks in his note indicating his indisposition to part with them.

On the evidence which I have now laid before the Reader, (and I have given every place which I have consulted,) I am obliged to maintain, that Mr. Valpy has formed his Text without any fixed principle, except that already adverted to, of avoiding in his alterations every thing which might hurt the feelings or offend the orthodoxy of those who take the Church of England as their standard. I can easily believe that his own prepossessions and attachments have had their full influence; but if he felt that he had not fortitude enough to surmount this influence, or to rise above popular obloquy, he should have left the Received Text as it was. The 8vo edition, for which alone the Rev. Edward Valpy is answerable, is mainly designed for the use of the younger Students in Divinity: it is dedicated to one whom every lover of liberal sentiments, and friend of religious liberty, must respect, the present excellent and venerable BISHOP OF NORWICH; and from various causes it is likely to get into the hands of numbers who will not or cannot consult Griesbach. It is truly grievous that a work which in some respects may be very useful, should present a *mangled text* of the Sacred Writings. If the Editor is right in the variations he *has* made, he is unjustifiable in passing by those which he *has not* made; for he has, thereby, virtually introduced the spurious interpolations or alterations of men. If he is right in leaving unaltered the passages which theological prepossessions, &c. would not allow him to alter, then he is unjustifiable in having adopted the variations he has. And at any rate, he is utterly unjustifiable in *passing by*, UNNOTICED, variations of great moment which Griesbach regards as fully established by evidence. The text should have been left as it

was, or *faithfully* altered. As far as the *text* is concerned, (and to this alone I have adverted,) it is a worthless edition; and, in this stage of scriptural criticism, marked with great culpability.*

The 12mo edition which has issued from the Valpy press is, I believe, a transcript of the foregoing text. It is for the use of schools; and it may serve to weaken the superstitious reverence often cherished for the Received Text: but it serves also to perpetuate its glaring errors. As I have already stated, it is said to be "*juxta exemplar præcipue Griesbachianum*:" I cannot discover that it exhibits Griesbach's text, in any case where Orthodoxy opposes the alteration.

When the Bishop of Raphoe next writes about "UNITARIAN PRACTICES," let him look at home, and see the course adopted by his own Brethren. Nothing that has ever been done by the Unitarians, even when the principles of Criticism were less understood than at present, bears the character of ALTERING THE SCRIPTURES TO SUIT A SYSTEM in comparison with the "practices" which I have developed in the Appendix. Before the Bishop, or any one of his admirers, reiterates his charges against the Improved Version, let him remove the fearful responsibility which rests upon DAKINS, VALPY, and AITTON; and, if they knew what they were doing, on the DUNCANS.

* It is with great pain I state these things respecting the Rev. E. Valpy, as an Editor of the Greek Testament; and if he read what I have written, and it do not too much excite his displeasure, it will cause him distress to review the course he has pursued in his momentous undertaking. I would suggest, as the best reparation now in his power, that he print a supplementary sheet, for the purchasers of his Edition, and to be inserted after his Preface in all that are unsold, containing *all* the cases of *any* moment, in which he has left Griesbach, with a clear statement of the evidence on which Griesbach has rested *his* alterations, and (if he still prefer the Received Text) the *critical* reasons of his own *preference*.

APPENDIX D.

*Consideration of BISHOP MAGEE's Remarks on the UNITARIAN
Interpretations, &c. of 1 COR. x. 9.*

Connected with Bishop Magee's criticisms on the rendering in the Improved Version of Heb. xiii. 25, 26, is a Note on 1 Cor. x. 9, extending through eighteen pages, on which I think it desirable to offer some remarks.

The *Received Text* thus reads this passage: Μηδε εκπειρα-
ζωμεν τον Χριστον, καθως και τινες αυτων επειρασαν, και υπο των
οφεων απωλονται. *Griesbach*, upon sufficient evidence, marks
the και before τινες, as of somewhat doubtful authority; and
though he retains Χριστον in his text, he prefixes to it the
mark which indicates his judgment, that Κυριον, the reading
in his margin, is *nearly equal, or perhaps even to be preferred,*
to that retained in the text. In his margin, however, (in his
own edition of 1805,) before Κυριον we find the *inferior* mark,
denoting that the reading to which it is prefixed *has consider-
able evidence, but still is inferior in authority to that in the
text.*—One of the marks is of course erroneous. It was sug-
gested to the Printer of the 2d volume of the *first* English
edition, that the larger edition of *Griesbach's text* printed
under his own inspection, (by Göschen of Leipsic,) might
assist in ascertaining what his judgment was. If this edition
was consulted, I suppose it was followed; at any rate, in the
first English edition, the *lower* mark was inserted in the text.
In *Griesbach's* smaller edition, however, printed also by
Göschen, (and, as I have already stated, p. 409, reprinted
with minute accuracy in America,) he prefixes to Κυριον the
higher mark, which indicates, to use *Griesbach's* own words,
“lectionem marginis supparem, aut æqualem, immo forsitan

præferendam esse vulgari lectioni, licet hanc in textu retinere maluerimus."* In the last London edition the *lower* mark is employed; I think it should have been the *higher*.

THE PUBLIC VERSION properly (as it respects this discussion) translates the Received Text, "Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents."

ARCHBISHOP NEWCOMB renders the verse, "Nor let us try the Lord, as some of them also tried *him*: and perished by serpents:" and in his Note he says, "If we read *Χριστῶν*, the sense is, Nor let us tempt, try, prove, provoke, Christ now, as some of them did God at that time."

THE IMPROVED VERSION follows NEWCOMB exactly in the Text, and copies his Note: adding to the latter, "' Christ'

* This very useful edition, which it would be very beneficial to reprint in England, was published, with the exception of the Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse, in 1805; this last portion was printed in 1806. From Griesbach's own Preface, written at Jena, in April 1805, it appears that the first portion was printed before the *critical edition* published at Halle had completed the Catholic Epistles. Nevertheless, as the first portion of the smaller Leipsic edition was printed *after* Griesbach had passed the Epistles of Paul in his critical edition, and much after the larger Leipsic edition (printed in 1803), we must consider Griesbach's judgment given in this smaller edition as his final one.

It may not be unpleasant to the Reader to see the veteran Critic's manly appreciation of the stability of his own text. He says that the text of the smaller edition, is the same with that of his second critical edition; and that he has seen no reason to depart from it, except in a very few cases, of scarcely any moment. He thus continues: "*Quæ enim contra crisin nostram ejusque fundamenta, in primis contra doctrinam de diversis sacri textus recensitionibus re-tustis, a non nemine prolata fuere, tam vana sunt et inania, ut me, quanquam omnia denuo curatissime et absque studio aut ira ex-pendentem, a sententia mea dimovere nequaquam potuerint.*"—*Præf.* p. v.

“ is the reading of the Received Text, and it is retained by
 “ Griesbach, even in his second edition. The word ‘ Lord ’ is
 “ adopted by the Primate, on the authority of the Vatican and
 “ Ephrem MSS. ‘ God ’ is the reading of the Alexandrian.”

MACKNIGHT, (of whose scriptural learning and general candour as well as orthodoxy no one can doubt,) has this Note on the passage (which he translates much as the Public Version). “ Most Commentators suppose the person tempted by
 “ the Israelites was Christ, because he is mentioned immedi-
 “ ately before. But that supposition makes Christ the person
 “ who spake the Law to the Israelites at Sinai, contrary I
 “ think to Hebr. i. 1, where it is said, ‘ God, who spake to the
 “ fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken to us
 “ by his Son.’ For *God who spoke to the fathers by the pro-
 “ phets, being the person who hath spoken to us by his Son, he
 “ cannot be the Son.* See also Hebr. ii. 2, 3 ; xii. 26. *I
 “ therefore think the person tempted by the Israelites was GOD
 “ THE FATHER,* and that the word GOD might be supplied as
 “ properly as the word CHRIST. Yet I have not ventured to
 “ insert it in the translation, lest it should be thought too
 “ bold an innovation ; though I am sensible *it is the true me-
 “ thod of completing the sentence.*”—On the first clause of the
 verse, he remarks, that “ when the Corinthian Christians, to
 “ avoid persecution, joined the heathens in their idolatrous
 “ feast, they showed great distrust of the power and goodness
 “ of their Master’s government”—the government of the
 world with which he was invested after his resurrection. This
 I have thought it necessary to add, lest it should be supposed
 I am concealing any thing.

The Reader is now prepared to consider the statements of
 BISHOP MAGEE, *Postscript*, p. 211 [675]. “ The Greek, in
 “ all the received copies,” meaning, I presume, all the printed
 editions which follow the Received Text, “ and as it is ad-
 “ mitted by Griesbach, stands thus : Μηδε” κ. τ. λ. “ Hence,
 “ then, is CHRIST named, and clearly pointed out as exist-
 “ ing under the Old Covenant. What is to be done now ?

“ Why, now that CHRIST is named, the word should be struck
 “ out ; and then the text gives no support to the idea of our
 “ Lord’s pre-existence. Certainly, all this is clear. But why
 “ strike it out ? Because there are some MSS. that read
 “ Κυριον, *the Lord*, and there are one or two that read Θεον,
 “ *God*. Well, admit all this. What follows ? Shall we take
 “ the report of *Griesbach* upon the evidence of the MSS. and
 “ Versions ?”

The Bishop then proceeds to assert, that the evidence for Κυριον has not led Griesbach “ to disturb the usual reading of
 “ the text, which, after the fullest investigation,” “ he has
 “ pronounced to be the true reading.” Now Griesbach, as we have seen, though he does not actually make the change, represents Κυριον as a reading of great probability ; and from his notation we have a right to affirm, that he thought it at least of nearly the same value as Χριστον, or perhaps even somewhat superior to it.—If the Bishop, therefore, has declared the truth, he has not declared the *whole* truth.

He afterwards says, “ In truth there can be no reasonable
 “ doubt which way the evidence lies as to the true reading.” I do not agree with him. In a controversial point of view, I consider it as a matter of indifference, which reading is adopted ; but the *external* evidence appears to preponderate for Κυριον : and it is almost solely because the Orthodox, of former days, appear to have preferred Κυριον, that I should deem the reading of the *Manuscripts* as less valuable here, than that of the *Versions*.* On the other hand these may

* The Bishop, in p. 222, proceeds in his usual style of insinuation, (in this case to depreciate the value of Griesbach’s critical decisions,) in reference to that Critic’s 8th Canon (*Proleg.* p. lxii.), viz. that *among different readings of the same text, that deserves suspicion which is obviously most favourable to the sentiments of the Orthodox*,—meaning, of course, those who were counted Orthodox in the age of manuscripts. The reasons he assigns for his canon,

possibly have given an interpretation rather than a close rendering of the word they found in the most ancient MSS.

But the Bishop further says, p. 213, "We have here a reading adopted by the Unitarians *directly against evidence.*" I hope the Bishop wrote this without having *examined* the fact. The Reader may perceive whether what he asserts is true, by considering the Note below, in which I have detailed, in a less abridged form, Griesbach's statement of evidence.*

are incontrovertible; and I know not how they could be stronger: that most, if not all, existing MSS., were written by men attached to the Catholic party; which makes it reasonable to suppose they would not pass over any reading in the copy from which they were transcribing that favoured them, and opposed the heretics: and that as a matter of historical fact we know, that even from the commencement of the third century, readings manifestly spurious, which countenanced the Orthodox notions, received every possible support; and that other readings of the same passage, which afforded no such countenance, were decried as the offspring of heretical perfidy.—The Bishop should have proved the canon to be a groundless one.

* The authorities for *Κυριον* are, the VATICAN, the EPHREM, 17, 31, 39, 46, 73, 80; the *later Syriac* Version in the margin, the *Coptic* in manuscript, the *Armenian* (but the Amsterdam and Constantinople editions have *Χριστον* in the margin), the *Æthiopic*; *Epiphanius* (who was of opinion that Marcion had changed *Κυριον* into *Χριστον*), *Chrysostom* in some places, *Theodoret*, *Joannes Damascenus*, the Epistle of the *Synod of Antioch* to Paul of Samosata, (where, however, Wetstein thinks *Χριστον* the true reading,) *Sedulius*, *Cassiodorus*. The following read *Θεον*: the ALEXANDRIAN, (in which Wetstein thinks that it was not the *original* reading, but Woide reports that no alteration has been made,) the No. 2 of Mill and Bengelius, No. 8 of the Slavonic MSS. and others more ancient; and *Bede*. The authorities for *Χριστον* are, the *Syriac* version, the *Arabic* in all the three editions, the *Sahidic*, the *Vulgate*, the *Italic*; *Theodotus*, *Chrysostom*, *Theophilus Antiochenus*,

That reading is asserted to be *directly against evidence*, which is supported by *many of the most weighty authorities*, which *Wetstein* has pronounced to be the preferable reading, and to which *Griesbach* has prefixed a mark of very high probability! So much, to use the Bishop's own words, *for PRECISION and TRUTH.**

And what shall we say, when he actually declares (p. 217), notwithstanding Griesbach's statement of evidence which he certainly knew of, because he cited it against Mr. Belsham, "that they reject the word *Χριστον* against the evidence of the "MSS. and Versions and Fathers;" though for *Χριστον* there is not one MANUSCRIPT produced, unless Stephens's *Σ*. be considered as affording evidence for *Χριστον*, by now reading *τῷ Χριστῷ*, whatever it did originally.†—I have often supposed,

Irenæus, Ambrose, Augustin, Ambrosiaster, and Pelagius. No. 23 (Steph. *Σ*. sec. viii.) has *τῷ Χριστῷ* as an altered reading.

* The Bishop of Raphoe uses this expression, in connection with an error in the *Calm Inquiry*, p. 157, where Mr. Belsham places the *Syriac* Version among the authorities for *Κυριον*. The Bishop is right in saying, that by *the Syriac* is understood the *ancient Syriac* or *Peschito*; but the *posterior Syriac* or *Philoxenian Version* affords, as we have seen, an ancient testimony for *Κυριον*.—Mr. Belsham also says, "Irenæus certainly read *Κυριον*." Here the Bishop triumphantly refers to Griesbach's statement of evidence, giving Irenæus as an authority for *Χριστον*. It appears to me that Mr. Belsham's "*certainly*" is too strong; but I hope the Bishop had not read Wetstein's argument on the subject, when he pronounced Mr. Belsham "*egregiously wrong*" on this point. After repeatedly weighing, as carefully as I can, the reasonings in Wetstein's note, I am satisfied, by the amount of the whole, (though dissatisfied with some parts,) that it is *very probable* that Irenæus read *Κυριον*. If he did, it goes far to decide the question.

† The Bishop had before said (p. 213) that "the MSS. and Versions pronounce" *Χριστον* to be "the true reading." The

when I have detected such glaring and egregious misrepresentations, that I must be wrong myself: it appeared inconceivable, that though the Bishop perverted our reasonings and our conclusions, he should so misrepresent plain *facts*, in order to bear down an opponent. Yet so it is. I know no controversial Writer, even of the lowest class, so utterly undeserving of credit. And the most melancholy part of the business is, that it is not for want of learning, and abilities, and opportunities to know the truth.

I pass by the curious tirade which follows (in p. 217), about the Editors rejecting *καὶ* against the preponderance of MSS., and adding Θεοῦ “ of their own arbitrary will and pleasure ;” because it merely respects the Note which they have copied from Archbishop Newcome.—But the Bishop, though he does not always appear to keep this fact in his mind, does say generally (p. 212) that Primate Newcome ” “ undoubt-
“ edly, in this, as well as in the passage treated of above ” (Hebr. xii. 25, 26), “ and in some other parts of his translation of the New Testament, has not acquitted himself in
“ the manner most creditable to him, either as a Critic, or as
“ a Theologian.” Most certainly, if Bishop Magee’s work is the standard of just criticism and theological investigation, Primate Newcome deserves *no* honour. Their systems are as remote as the antipodes. How I appreciate the productions and character of that excellent man, I have already repeatedly stated ; I now venture to predict, that the name of Newcome will be respected, and his writings valued and consulted, long after this now celebrated work on Atonement has sunk into oblivion, or is cited only to show the course which should be carefully shunned in controversy by the sincere and judicious lover of religious truth.

authority of the Manuscripts is unequivocally against it. Such assertions surely were only designed for those who examine nothing for themselves.

The Bishop declares (p. 213) that this reading, *Kυριον*, is “adopted by the Unitarians, directly against evidence, *for the express purpose of preventing the application of a passage to Christ, which must establish his pre-existence.*” Let the Reader, after perusing again the quotation from *Macknight* (p. 421), decide, whether, in the cooler and sounder judgment of a learned Trinitarian, who had studied the Scriptures as a whole much more than the Bishop appears to have done, this conclusion is a necessary one.—In my opinion it would have been best for the Improved Version to have left Newcome and have followed Griesbach’s *text*; although no one can fairly say that Griesbach is *decided* against *Kυριον*, who considers the facts I have laid before him. There is undoubtedly great room for indecision as to the true reading: and I feel no concern, (except the general desire of knowing what the Apostle really wrote,) which is finally adopted. Whichever is adopted, the passage cannot of itself decide any thing. Even if we read *Kυριον*, it may mean Christ; and I am disposed to think that it does: if we read *Χριστον*, of course it must. But in either case it leaves the last part ambiguous. Suppose the Apostle had said, And let us not be disobedient to Christ, as some of them also were disobedient, &c.,—who would have thought it necessary to interpret it, as our Orthodox brethren commonly interpret this passage? And it is equally unnecessary here, even in the rendering of the Public Version, which is what it ought to be. It *may* mean, as far as the verbal import merely is concerned, that *Christ* was the person-whom the Israelites tempted; but it *need* not: and if the interpretation is not necessary, it *must* be an *erroneous* one. Bishop Magee virtually admits (p. 215) that GOD and CHRIST are DIFFERENT *Beings*: if so, the question is decided. On authority which the Christian cannot resist, (see John viii. 54), I maintain that the FATHER is the Being whom the Jews call *their God*;—and that it was HE, who was the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, or, in other words, JEHOVAH:—and that, *therefore*, it was HE against whom the Israelites rebelled in the wilderness.

If the reading *Χριστον* necessarily involved an interpretation directly contradictory to the declarations of Revelation, the apostolical authority of St. Paul would require that we should (even on slighter evidence) take the reading which does not involve it. If any reading makes one inspired person absolute contradict another, it cannot be the true one.

In the 2d Edition of *Unitarianism &c.*, p. 229, I adverted to the late Mr. Simpson's interpretation of the passage, as "probable and well-deserving of minute examination;" though want of opportunity, I stated, prevented me from minutely examining it. This excellent and able Critic, (who has furnished in his *Essays* abundant proof of his persevering honest serious search after scriptural truth, and abundant materials to aid others, even where they do not adopt his conclusions,) observing that Moses was *the anointed* (ὁ χριστός) of God (Hebr. xi. 26), the Mediator by whom the Divine Being communicated the blessings of the Old Covenant, thought that the passage ought to be thus explained, "Nor let us try *the Anointed* (i. e. the Messiah, Acts x. 26), as some of them also tried *the Anointed* (i. e. Moses)."—I am now satisfied (though not by Bishop Magee's expressions of contempt) that this interpretation is untenable; and I think the passage simply means, "Let us not be rebellious and distrustful towards Christ, as some of them also were rebellious and distrustful, and perished by serpents:" But I do not less highly appreciate the abilities and scriptural learning of this conscientious searcher after divine truth, nor the general value of his works. The Bishop, however, at once comes (p. 227) to this conclusion. This "CONTRIVANCE," referring to the above interpretation, "is the INVENTION of a *Mr. Simpson*, communicated in a work which he has entitled *Essays on the Language of Scripture*; and which, from the specimens produced, I REJOICE THAT I HAVE NEVER SEEN."* I

* In the able and interesting *Tribute to the Memory of the Rev. John Simpson*, by the Rev. Joseph Hunter of Bath, is the following

really do not think that the Bishop would derive any benefit from the Essays; but many others have found them, and

“ testimony of an anonymous correspondent of the Bath Chronicle,” “ said to come from the pen of a very liberal and enlightened Clergyman.”

“ Real worth is usually retired and unobtrusive; and the high qualities of the head and heart of the late Mr. Simpson would have been known and admired only by the circle of his personal friends, had not his zeal for the holy cause of religious truth overcome the natural modesty of his disposition, and induced him to give to the public, at different times, the results of his investigations in the line of Biblical literature. Marked equally by depth of research and acuteness of remark, his publications bear ample testimony of his erudition and sagacity; and the spirit of mildness and Christian charity which pervades them, while it reflects the character of his own mind, holds out a bright example to those who are engaged in *scriptural interpretation*, of the manner in which such subjects should be discussed; and such arguments conducted. Of his conclusions and deductions, in several of his publications, different descriptions of believers will form different opinions, according to their previously-established notions on the points in question: but, with respect to his largest and most important work, his ‘View of the Evidences of Christianity,’ there can be but one opinion among reasonable, reflecting, and sincere Christians,—that it is a most useful, masterly, and excellent performance; and may be ranked, in merit and value, with the moral demonstrations of the verity of our holy faith, elaborated by the deep erudition and rare sagacity of Jeremy Taylor and John Locke, Dr. Lardner, Samuel Clarke, and Archdeacon Paley.”

I cannot deny myself the pleasure of extracting the following passages from Mr. Hunter’s Sermon, which may assist in rescuing us from the most injurious stigma thrown upon us, as possessed of no reverence for the Scriptures.

“ Our Friend gave very close attention to those writings,” the Scriptures, “ and imploring on his researches the blessing of the

many more will find them, of great service in their inquiries.

Because *Dr. Carpenter* mentions this interpretation “with much approbation,” and “quotes it, with other matter equally “precious from the same Writer,”—and because “this publication of *Dr. Carpenter's* is,” the Bishop apprehends, “the “latest of the Unitarian productions, that treat of this part of “Scripture, we have therefore reason to consider this as “THEIR *latest and MOST RECOGNIZED exposition of the text.*” Dr. Magee certainly knows nothing at all about us. I do not believe that a single individual knew of my Note till it was published : I did not express myself as having adopted this interpretation : though I have received encouraging assurances that the volume referred to has, under the divine

God of truth, sought to understand from them the truth as it is in Jesus. It is no disparagement of him to say, that in the course of this inquiry his views of that truth many times underwent a change, and that it was not till he had reached the middle of his life, that even on some of the greater points in controversy among Christians, he had arrived at that conviction in which he continued to the last. Never did he arrive at a conviction which precluded farther researches. All who knew him, knew also that to the last he was inquiring at the divine oracles, and asking there for information concerning his God, his duty, and his hopes.”—*Tribute*, p. 20.

“*The Bible, the Bible*, with him was every thing. In the words of the Psalmist prefixed to this discourse, ‘His delight was in the law of the LORD, and in his word did he meditate day and night.’ He laboured in it diligently as for hidden treasures. But he did not regard it only as a book, where was to be gained an acquaintance with the doctrines of the Christian religion, and of the previous revelations which God had made to the world, but he drew from it the rules for the daily regulation of his heart and conduct.”—*Tribute*, p, 25.

I recommend the whole Discourse to the perusal of the Bishop of Raphoe.

blessing, being of service in promoting the sentiments I regard as scriptural truth, I never heard that any one of my fellow Unitarians adopted my interpretations of particular passages; and yet now this interpretation is represented as “the most recognized exposition of the text” among Unitarians. I should indeed rejoice to see room to believe, that Bishop Magee’s case was nothing more than what he describes Bishop Cumberland’s to have been: “With a preconceived system, and “a predominant terror, even the mind of Cumberland was “not likely to puruse a steady and unbiassed course.”—*Disc.* vol. i. p. 393.

On a vastly more important point, the Bishop egregiously misrepresents us. He has read enough of our works to *know* the following indisputable fact; that the Unitarians rest their denial of the *proper deity* of our Lord, not upon their interpretations of the passages usually brought to prove it; but upon the declarations of Moses and the Prophets, of Christ and the Apostles,—numerous, express, and unequivocal,—which to our minds *prove*, beyond all doubt, that **JEHOVAH, the GOD and FATHER of our Lord Jesus Christ, is the ONLY TRUE GOD.** And yet this Writer, who in his unlimited zeal against Unitarians seems to forget all the restraints of common decorum and the plainest principles of truth and justice, does not scruple to say, “The Unitarians, then, stake their “denial of the *divinity** of our Lord, upon the propriety of “their rejection of the word ‘Christ’ from this text, in “opposition to the authorities by which alone genuine “Scripture can be ascertained: that is, they **STAKE THEIR “VERY SALVATION, on the adoption of a reading which is “AGAINST evidence.**”—*Postscript*, p. 214 [678].

* I take for granted he means the **DEITY** of our Lord. The Unitarians, while they deny, because they believe the Scriptures do, the Deity of our Lord’s *person*, maintain, as firmly as their opponents, the **DIVINITY** of his *doctrine*, his *precepts*, and his *authority*.

The evidence of *Versions* is against it : the decided evidence of *Manuscripts*, and even the preponderating evidence of *Fathers* is *for* it. But there is a passage in the Received Text and Public Version, which is *against EVERY species of ANCIENT evidence*, for which many Trinitarians, and even some who are Critics, still earnestly contend, in support of a doctrine on which they believe salvation depends. And this is only one among many of the instances, in which the charges made by the Orthodox against the Unitarian, the Unitarian might return with tenfold force against those who make it.

APPENDIX E.

*Original Letter from Dr. PRIESTLEY to Dr. ESTLIN; and
Mr. JERVIS's Notice of the late Mr. BRETLAND.*

In consequence of a public notice of a *Course of Lectures*, to be delivered, during the present winter, (Dec. 1819,) in Lewin's Mead Meeting, on the *Evidences of Revelation*, the Widow of my late respected Predecessor, the Rev. John Prior Estlin, LL. D., favoured me with a copy of his *Sermon on the Evidences*, in reference to the Age of Reason; and with it the following letter from Dr. Priestley, written on receiving a copy of the Sermon. This letter is, in various respects, so interesting, and so accordant with the views I have expressed of the character of this eminent Christian, that I requested Mrs. Estlin's permission, (with which she has obliged me,) to insert it in my Appendix. I give it to the Reader, unreservedly, as it came from the pen of Dr. Priestley.

“ Northumberland, June 25, 1797.

“ Dear Sir,

“ Though I have been too negligent in acknowledging the receipt of your valuable pamphlet relating to Mr. Paine, and infidelity in general, I was not the less pleased with it. I admired both the sentiment and the language. You express yourself with great propriety and force. If any good is to be done, it will be done by such writings as yours. Your piece on Atheism is not yet come to hand, but I expect it every day. I wished to have seen it before I wrote to you, but having an opportunity of sending to Philadelphia, I was unwilling to delay writing any longer.

“ You will find that almost every thing I have published since

I have come hither has had the same object with yours, and I rejoice to find in you so able a coadjutor. There is, indeed, a great call upon every man who has talents and a sufficient knowledge of the subject, and of the world, to stand forth in defence of every principle that is of real value, moral as well as more properly religious; for we now plainly see that they go together. For nothing can be more licentious than the principles of many of the modern unbelievers. They are finely exposed in a work intitled *Helvian Letters*, which I have some thoughts of translating and abridging; but it is hardly possible to draw any degree of attention on such subjects in this country, at least this part of it. Notwithstanding the many solid advantages possessed by this country, it appears to me that there is less of *religion* than with you. As to rational religion, which alone can be opposed with effect to the infidelity that prevails so much, it is hardly known here. While I am preaching and writing against the common enemy, they are preaching and writing against me.

“ I thank you for the articles of intelligence in your first letter, especially those relating to yourself, and I rejoice much in what you say on the same subject in your last. Perhaps when the term you mention is expired, you may think of settling with us. But at present you would find no employment here as a preacher, though there is a great want of good schoolmasters. The habits of living, and the state of society here, are so different from those in England, that very few persons coming thence, except in the class of mechanics, can soon reconcile themselves to it, and the women are almost universally discontented. And living in the larger towns, as Philadelphia, or New York, which are all that I have seen, is disagreeable, as well as expensive, in the extreme. It is something better, I believe, in New England. But a train of circumstances have brought me hither, and here I find all that I want. A more pleasant spot is hardly to be found any where: having now built my house, and got the use of my books and instruments, I have all the leisure I can desire for all my pursuits, and as much and as good society as I wish for. Still, however, if there should be a peace, I should be tempted to pay you a visit before I die.

“ I thank you for your kind sympathy in my heavy losses. I

feel them deeply, but never before felt so much the real power of religion to enable me to bear them. All evils are only for a time, and a short one; and will all lead to good. How little to be envied are the most prosperous of unbelievers! How gloomy are their prospects! I am glad to find you have noticed *Dupuis' Work*. I have not yet seen it, but I have quoted and animadverted upon a short account of it sent me in MS. by himself before I left England, in a new edition of my *Observations on the Increase of Infidelity*. It must be absurd in the extreme. I will get Johnson to send me a copy. Nothing is to be had here without ordering it from Europe. This is the greatest inconvenience I labour under.

“ I hope you will continue to favour me with your letters, and I promise to be a more punctual correspondent in future.

“ With my best respects to Mrs. Estlin,

“ I am,

“ Dear Sir,

“ Yours sincerely,

“ J. PRIESTLEY.”

The estimable individual to whom the above Letter was addressed, was favoured with a dismissal from life, corresponding in serenity and cheerful hope to that of Dr. Priestley. After retiring from the engagements of the Pastor and the Preceptor, he went to his usual residence during the vacations, where the decays of nature rapidly came upon him. He continued in the little circle of his family and friends those services in which he delighted. On the day of his dissolution, (Sunday, Aug. 10, 1817,) the subject of his discourse was *the Resurrection to Eternal Life*; and it was the object of his prayers, that all who were then uniting in acts of worship on earth, might be prepared to meet around the throne of God in heaven. He watched the fine setting of the sun with unusual interest, and then said, “ Now I am ready;” probably meaning—to retire. Within a short time he had fallen asleep

in Jesus, breathing his last, without a groan, in the arms of affection.

Since this event, another aged Minister of Christ, my much-respected Friend Mr. BRETLAND, has been removed from the scenes of time. His contributions to Scriptural Criticism have obtained for him the sarcastic censures of Dr. Magee. (See *Disc.* vol. i. p. 81—83, and *Postscr.* p. 152.) The just and elegant tribute to his memory, from the pen of the Rev. T. JERVIS, late of Leeds, which was inserted in the *Monthly Repository* for July 1819, will enable the Reader to know much more of the real excellencies of his intellectual and moral character; and if the Reader should wish to judge for himself, and to see the sentiments of this truly Christian Divine, on subjects of a practical and devotional nature, I refer him, with confidence, to the *Sermons* which he prepared for the press, and which are now printing under the superintendence of his Executor, our mutual and highly valued Friend, Mr. W. B. KENNAWAY of Exeter. One of them, now lying before me, addressed to Young Men, contains exhortations to the frequent and serious perusal of the Scriptures, showing how highly he appreciated the value of those sacred records, which were the object of his constant study and reflection, and “where,” to use his own words, “all our
“ duties are enjoined by a divine authority, enforced by the
“ most awful sanctions, and shown to be practicable by exem-
“ plifications of them in the lives of the worthiest characters.”
“ They also abound,” he afterwards says (p. 99), “ with pious
“ and sublime reflections of holy men on the attributes and
“ government of God, with effusions of the most glowing and
“ lofty devotion, with the workings of the heart when affected
“ with deep penitential sorrow, with grateful feelings and ex-
“ pressions of holy joy arising from a sense of the pardon of
“ sin and a renewal of the divine favour. These, with other
“ things of a like kind, tend to produce and improve a devo-
“ tional frame of mind, humility and self-abasement under a
“ consciousness of sin and folly, and the reviving hope of the

**“divine mercy and forgiveness on repentance and newness of
“life.”**

The above extract I submit to the consideration of such as have been misled by such expressions as those of Dr. Magee, which I have quoted above, in p. 77; and I will now lay before my Readers the Obituary Notice, above alluded to, of the excellent Author, whom I have elsewhere (*Unitarianism, &c.*, 1811, p. 251) spoken of as “an avowed Unitarian” in the limited sense of the term, “for little short of half a century,” and “I believe, the first Unitarian preacher in the West of England.”

“Died, July 6th, 1819, at his house in Exeter, aged 77, the Rev. JOSEPH BRETLAND. He was a native of that ancient city, in which he spent the whole of a long-protracted life in the uniform habits of literary retirement. Purity of heart, rectitude of conduct, and simplicity of manners, were prominent features in the character of this virtuous man. Endowed with strong intellectual powers, his application was constant and unremitting, and his mental attainments were proportionably great. The love of truth might justly be considered his ruling passion; while his calm and philosophic mind was ever assiduous and indefatigable in the pursuit of it. His religious opinions, which were strictly Unitarian, were the result of candid, free, and deliberate inquiry, adopted upon the fullest conviction, and, though formed at an early period, they were established and confirmed by the subsequent reflection, and persevering research, of his maturer years. In morals, in theology, in metaphysics, and in biblical criticism, his learning was profound, his judgment solid and acute, his integrity inflexible and unimpeached. These qualifications and endowments are sufficiently evinced by the few productions of his pen, which his genuine modesty and humility permitted him to commit to the press. As a preacher, the discourses of this distinguished scholar and divine were marked by a chaste and correct style of composition, and a rational, undissembled, and elevated piety; while they were addressed to the hearts of his hearers, in a simple and impressive tone of delivery. Mr. Bretland, at different periods of life, engaged in conducting the religious services of two most respectable congregations of Protestant Dissenters in the city of

Exeter. Both these connexions, however, were only temporary. Upon principle, and for reasons satisfactory to his own conscientious mind, he afterwards declined the regular and stated exercise of the ministry, and retired from the public duties of his profession, and passed the remainder of his days in serenity and peace ; till, at length, he closed a life of study and seclusion from the ordinary pursuits and vanities of the world—a life devoted to truth, to sincerity, to piety, and resignation to the will of God, without a struggle or a sigh—and calmly fell asleep in the happy assurance of a glorious immortality.”

While turning over a volume of tracts containing Mr. Manning's Funeral Sermon for Dr. Estlin, I met with the following extract from a paper written by Dr. Toulmin, (see above, p. 77,) “ with reference to his dissolution ;” with which I will close my volume.

“ I look forward to death with serenity and hope ; supported in the view of that awful event, by a firm persuasion of the infinite and essential mercy of God, and thankful for those clear and full assurances given of it by Jesus Christ, in whom I rejoice as the divine Author of Christianity, and in whom I confide as the appointed Lord of the dead and the living, and the promise of whose second appearance, to raise the righteous from the grave to glory and immortality, excites my delightful hope.”

Such were the prospects of a pious Christian, whose discriminating sentiments were included in those words of the Apostle Paul,—

‘ THERE IS ONE GOD, AND ONE MEDIATOR BETWEEN GOD AND MEN, THE MAN CHRIST JESUS.’

Printed by Browne & Manchee, 10, Clare-Street.

By the Author of the foregoing volume.

UNITARIANISM THE DOCTRINE OF THE GOSPEL : A View of the Scriptural Grounds of Unitarianism ; with an Examination of all the Expressions in the New Testament which are generally considered as supporting opposite Doctrines. The Second Edition, with Corrections and other Alterations. Price 6s.

PROOF FROM SCRIPTURE that GOD, even the FATHER, is the Only True God, and the Only Proper Object of Religious Worship : Containing Remarks on the Rev. Dr. J. PYE SMITH's Discourse on the Adoration of our Lord Jesus Christ. Second Edition. Price 1s.

A COMPARATIVE VIEW of the Scriptural Evidence for UNITARIANISM and TRINITARIANISM. Second Edition. Price 6d.

THE UNITARIAN'S APPEAL, with the Texts referred to. Price 1d.—The same, without the Texts, price 6d. per dozen.

A BRIEF VIEW OF THE GROUNDS OF DISSENT from the Church of England by Law Established. Second Edition. Price 6d.

ISAIAH'S PROPHETIC TITLES OF THE MESSIAH, shown to be strictly applicable to Jesus Christ, and perfectly consistent with the Absolute Unity and Unrivalled Supremacy of Jehovah. A Discourse delivered on Christmas-day, 1816. Price 1s.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT : Comprising a summary Chronological and Geographical View of the Events recorded respecting the Ministry of our Saviour : Accompanied with Maps and Questions for Examination Principally designed for the Use of Young Persons, and for the Sunday-Employment of Schools. Fourth Edition. Price 4s.

In part by the same Author.

SYSTEMATIC EDUCATION ; or, Elementary Instruction in the various departments of Literature and Science ; with Practical Rules for studying each branch of Useful Knowledge. Second Edition. In two volumes, 8vo., with Plates. Price 1l. 11s. 6d.

Of this work, the *Practical Essay of Education*, the Chapters on *History*, and the *Letter on the Evidence of the Christian Religion*, are by the Rev. W. SHEPHERD; the Chapters on *Grammar*, *Mental and Moral Philosophy*, and *Logic*, (and, in the second Edition, those on *Ancient Geography*,) are by Dr. CARPENTER; and the remainder of the work by the late Rev. J. JOYCE.

LETTERS ON THE TRINITARIAN CONTROVERSY, inserted in the *Exeter Newspapers*, at the close of 1814, and the beginning of 1815: in Three Parts; Price 1s. 6d. each.

Part I. contains the Original Advertisement by AMICUS PATRIÆ, and the Letters of the Rev. Dr. CLEEVE, and the TRUE CHURCHMAN, with Dr. CARPENTER's in Reply; and those of Mr. THOMAS FOSTER, VERITAS, A. Z., &c.

Part II. contains the Letters of the Rev. Prebendary DENNIS.—N. B. Mr. Dennis declined printing these with Dr. CARPENTER's, &c., in reply: but this Part is represented in the Imprint as sold by the Publishers of the present volume.

Part III. contains the Letters of "ANONYMOUS but not St. Paul or Jonas Dennis," those of PACIFICUS, PHILO-VERITAS, A. M., CHRISTIANUS BIBLICUS, the Rev. JOHN WILLIAMS (in reply to Prebendary Dennis's Charge respecting the Bibles), and several Letters by Dr. CARPENTER, principally in reply to Mr. Dennis.

Speedily will be published,

PRINCIPLES OF EDUCATION, *Intellectual, Moral, and Physical*: Originally composed by the Author of this volume, for Dr. Rees's Cyclopædia.

Sold by Messrs. LONGMAN & Co.

THE EXETER COLLECTION OF PSALMS and HYMNS, for Social and Private Worship. Price in extra boards, the 4th Ed. 12mo. 4s., the 5th Ed. 2s. 6d., and the 6th Ed. 32mo. 2s.

This Collection is employed in about Thirty Unitarian Congregations; and may be had, in sheets, in quantities not less than twenty, on the following terms, by applying to the Rev. J. MANNING, or Mr. B. P. POPE, *Exeter*; the Rev. B. MARDON, *Glasgow*; or the Rev. Dr. CARPENTER, *Bristol*:—viz. the 12mo. Ed. at 2s. per copy; the 24mo. at 1s.; and the 32mo. at 25 copies for a guinea.





